DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 089 920 RC 007 837

AUTHOR	Lever, B. F.
TITLE	Arkansas State Annual Evaluation Report for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1971, ESEA Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
INSTITUTION	Arkansas State Dept. of Education, Little Rock.
PUB DATE	30 Jun 71
NOTE	104p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$5.40 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Activities; Annual Reports; Community Involvement; *Evaluation; Expenditures; *Federal Programs; Financial Support; Inservice Programs; *Rural Schools; *Small Schools; Standardized Tests; Statistical Data
IDENTIFIERS	Arkansas; Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I

ABSTRACT

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I program in Arkansas for 1971 is described in this annual report. During this year the 385 eligible public school districts spent in excess of $24 million on programs to meet the needs of educationally deprived children. Major changes in the statewide program included a change from dual segregated systems to unified systems, new guidelines, and the use of standardized test scores. Information on the staff, inservice training, and community and parental involvement is presented along with statistical data on the expenditures of Title I funds, participants and amounts by activities, approved projects by size of district and services offered, size and scope, and Title I participants during the summer term and the regular term. Descriptions of the most successful activities in some of the individual schools and school districts are presented in a narrative portion of the report. (PS)

Lobosco

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED 089920

RECEIVED
DEC 17 1973
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

RC

ARKANSAS

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ESEA Title I

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

STATE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING

JUNE 30, 1971

RC007837

A R K A N S A S

FY 1971

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

FEDERAL PROGRAMS DIVISION

A. W. FORD
Director of Education

B. G. WILLIAMS
Associate Director for Federal Programs, P. L. 89-10

C. E. MORRIS
Coordinator, Title I, ESEA

Prepared by:
B. F. LEVER
Supervisor, Evaluation and Statistics

INTRODUCTION

This report covers the sixth year of Arkansas' Title I program. The 385 eligible public school districts of the State spent in excess of $24 million on programs to meet the needs of educationally deprived children. Most of the school districts in Arkansas are completely rural and most are small. There are only 27 districts encompassing cities of more than 10,000 population. A tremendous change has occurred in many Arkansas schools during the past two years in converting from dual "freedom of choice" systems to completely unified systems. Of the 385 districts, 325 used the entire district as a project area for the Title I program last year, because there was no more than one school at any given grade level. There were 318 school districts with allocations for Title I of less than $100,000 even with Arkansas' average ratio of formula eligibles to school population of over 30%. Of the 385 eligible districts, 320 qualified for grants under Part C of the Title because of a factor of 20% or greater in formula eligibles to total school population, but no school was large enough to qualify with 5,000 formula eligible.

The 1971 fiscal year represents a most difficult Title I program to evaluate from the state level. It was a year in which many schools changed abruptly during the school term from dual segregated systems to unified systems, bringing radical changes in the attendance patterns, Title I project areas and Title I activities. Pre and post

tests were difficult to match because of changes in student participating.

Major changes were brought about in many Title I programs during the year by the SEA. New SEA guidelines governing program content were used to phase out general education activities. Many local administrators had operated one or more Title I activities which were determined to be too general in nature to be eligible to continue or which were determined to be supplanting local efforts. Many programs were discontinued and substitutes were instituted without the kind of staff preparation, needs assessments, and other planning that was necessary to initiate effective activities.

A further disruption occurred when management review teams and HEW audits required program changes during the project year. New program guides from the U.S. Office of Education gave new interpretations for auxiliary services which required complete re-evaluation of this area of projects. Congress passed P.L. 91-230 which added many new requirements to be instituted during the year. The new National School Lunch Act which went into effect during the year permitted the shifting of $2,000,000 being spent annually for food back into other Title I activities.

For the past two years the SEA has required submission of standardized test scores for all project area children at all grade levels where Title I activities have existed. From these test results we have been able to establish pictures of the academic deficiencies which have also

caused the SEA to seek extensive revision in local program content.

All of these changes may be good for Arkansas' school systems and most may contribute to improve Title I programs, but the number of changes makes evaluation of the year's Title I activities very difficult in terms of specific student progress.

C.E. Morris

Coordinator, ESEA Title I

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	BASIC STATISTICS	1
II.	STAFF	
	A. State Educational Agency Level	1
	B. Local Educational Agency Level	3
III.	STATISTICAL DATA	
	A. Expenditures of Title I Funds	5
	B. Participants and Amounts by Activities	6
	C. Approved Projects by Size of District and Services Offered	10
	D. Size and Scope	11
	E. Title I Participants (Regular Term)	15
	F. Title I Participants (Summer Term)	20
IV.	MOST SUCCESSFUL ACTIVITIES	
	A. Prairie Grove Elementary School	24
	B. Magnet Cove School District	26
	C. Searcy Special School District	29
	D. Osceola School District	32
	E. North Little Rock School District	45
	F. Rogers School District	48
	G. Hope School District	52
	H. El Dorado School District	64
	I. Wynne School District	73
	J. Bay-Brown School District	90
V.	INSERVICE TRAINING	92
VI.	COMMUNITY AND PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	93

SECTION - I

BASIC STATISTICS

SECTION - II

STAFF

A. Chart I - Title I Staff Full Time Equivalency

B. Chart II - Percent of Time Spent on Objectives

C. Chart III - LEA Title I Staff by Assignment and Number

TITLE I, ESEA

FY 1971

I. BASIC STATISTICS

A. Number of participating LEA's in the State: 385-

B. LEA's participating in Title I

1. Regular School Term: 262
2. Summer Term: 0
3. Regular and Summer Terms: 123

C. Total number of pupils participating in Title I programs (unduplicated count)

	Regular Term	Summer Term	After Hours
1. Enrolled in public schools	139,359	17,305	300
2. Enrolled in private schools	1,236	23	

D. Cooperative Projects: 5

1. Number of schools participating: 31
2. Number of pupils particiapting: 6,338

E. Total dollar amount of Grant Award: $24,214,456.00

F. Total dollar amount expended (disbursements and unliquidated obligations): $21,948,297.31

G. Balance in Title I Account - June 31, 1971: $ 2,266,158.69

II. STAFF

A. SEA Level

There were 30 State agency ESEA, Title I Staff members with a full time equivalency of 23.72 employed to assist local school agencies with their Title I programs during the year. The following Chart will show staff employed by category assignment showing full time equivalency of each employee for the year:

CHART I

SEA TITLE I STAFF FULL TIME EQUIVALENCY

FOR TY 1971

STAFF MEMBER	TITLE	F.T.E.
Mr. B.G. Williams	Associate Director	.61
Mr. C.E. Morris	Coordinator of Title I	1.00
Mr. Olen Taylor	Coordinator of Finance	.61
Mr. Earl Glover	Supervisor of Finance	.69
Mr. William P. Batson	Area Supervisor	1.00
Mr. Don Hindman	Area Supervisor	1.00
Mr. R.A. Carpenter	Area Supervisor	1.00
Mr. Bob Kerr	Area Supervisor	1.00
Mr. Eugene Channell	Supervisor, Special Services	1.00
Mrs. Sara Murphy	Coordinator of Dissemination and Follow Through	.20
Mrs. Elizabeth Smith	Follow Through Specialist	.05
Mr. Charles Ellis	Information Officer	.50
Mr. B.F. Lever	Supervisor Evaluation & Statistics	.87

Each professional staff member shown above is provided adequate secretarial services. There were 17 support personnel employed to aid in statistical and monitoring services. The Administrative money used for the fiscal year 1970-71 for the State agency staff was $174,288.25.

The following Chart is a breakdown of visits made by SEA personnel and the percent of time spent on each objective as reported by Title I Staff:

CHART II

PERCENT OF TIME SPENT ON OBJECTIVES

TITLE I STAFF	TOTAL FIELD VISITS	PROGRAM PLANNING	PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	PROGRAM OPERATION	PROGRAM EVALUATION	PROGRAM BUDGET FINANCE	PROGRAM DISSEMINATION
Title I Area Supervisors	388	25%	30%	16%	14%	9%	6%
Title I Coordinator	40	30%	30%	30%		10%	
Evaluation Supervisor	15				100%		
Information Officer	19						100%
Finance Supervisor	0					100%	
Dissemination Coordinator	8						100%
Spec. Services Supervisor	72	25%	25%	20%	10%	15%	5%
Associate Director	20	20%	15%	15%	20%	10%	20%
Follow Through Specialist	2						100%

B. LEA Level

A total of 104 coordinators with a full time equivalency of 74.81 were employed by 102 local educational agencies to aid with program operations. Better programs were facilitaed through 5 cooperative projects formed by 31 smaller school districts. Smaller school districts operated programs under the supervision of regular school personnel with some districts employing a clerk where it was justifiable.

The responsibility for operating projects was largely that of the district personnel, in addition to the staff employed at the State level. The following Title I staff (Chart III) was employed at the LEA level to operate programs:

CHART III

LEA TITLE I STAFF

By Assignment and Number

ASSIGNMENT	REGULAR TERM FTE	SUMMER TERM FTE	AFTER HOURS FTE
Direction & Management (Admin.)	74.81	15.40	.25
Teaching Kindergarten	19.22	65.00	
Teaching Elementary	847.98	611.10	1.22
Teaching Secondary	374.88	231.66	.66
Teaching Handicapped	169.49	1.00	
Librarian	156.32	22.00	
Counseling	144.13	6.50	.12
Supervision	29.02	28.99	
Psychologist	4.20		
Teacher Aide	443.51	142.60	6.00
Librarian Aide	139.90	7.00	2.00
Social Worker	105.14	7.40	
Attendance Worker	30.56	1.33	
Nurse	110.20	16.00	
Physician	.25		
Dentist	1.50		
Clerical - Instruction	155.63	17.50	
Clerical - Administration	261.51	14.55	
Custodial	29.79	44.25	
Vehicle Operation	15.90	153.70	
Nurse Aide	14.50	1.00	
Cooking & Sewing	1.00	2.00	
Testing	14.32	1.00	
Teaching Pre-Kindergarten	.25	10.00	
Total Number of Employees	3144.01	1399.98	10.25

SECTION - III

STATISTICAL DATA

Information Taken From the Districts' FY 1971 Annual Evaluation and Final Fiscal Reports

A. Expenditures of Title I Funds for FY 1971

B. Participants and Amounts by Activities

C. Approved Projects by Size of District and Services Offered

D. Size and Scope

E. Total Title I Participants (*Regular Term*)

F. Total Title I Participants (*Summer Term*)

EXPENDITURES OF TITLE I FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970-71.

DISTRICT NAME STATEWIDE

ACTY CODE	ACTIVITY	SALARIES	OTHER	TOTAL	PERCENT OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES .07
0100	ADMINISTRATION	1,325,523.29	133,385.76	1,458,909.05	6.97
0200	INST. SALARY	12,599,780.14	579,505.00	13,179,285.14	63.00
0201	INSERVICE ED.	25,844.79	59,576.30	85,421.09	.41
0202	TEXT BOOKS		98,080.15	98,080.15	.47
0203	A/V MATERIALS		135,087.31	135,087.31	.65
0204	LIBRARY EXPENSE		113,093.58	113,093.58	.54
0205	OTHER INST. EXP.		598,209.63	598,209.63	2.86
0300	ATTENDANCE SERVICE	245,267.77	20,979.99	266,247.76	1.27
0400	HEALTH SERVICE	512,686.53	291,427.44	804,113,97	3.84
0500	TRANSPORTATION	59,935.64	125,150.16	185,085.80	.88
0600	PLANT OPERATION	75,614.76	273,402.13	349,016.89	1.67
0700	PLANT MAINTENANCE	6,150.45	159,760.02	165,910.47	.79
0800	FIXED CHARGES		1,845,110.04	1,845,110.47	8.82
0900	FOOD SERVICES	13,556.00	362,835.73	376,391.73	1.80
1000	STUDENT BODY ACTIVITIES	651.00	57,312.55	57,963.55	.28
1100	COMMUNITY SERVICES	294,860.98	376,233.05	671,094.03	3.28
1220	MINOR REMODELING	834.40	28,309.41	29,143.81	.10
1230	EDUCATIONAL T.V. EQUIP.		14,557.27	14,557.27	.06
1231	A/V EQUIPMENT		109,306.19	109,306.19	.52
1232	OTHER INST. EQUIP.		272,340.64	272,340.64	1.30
1233	NON-INST. EQUIP.		103,016.77	103,016.64	.49
	TOTALS	15,160,705.75	5,756,679.12	20,917,384.87	100.00

TOTAL FUNDS RECEIVED	22,091,500.00
LESS TOTAL PROJECT EXPENDITURE	20,917,384.87
CARRY-OVER TO PROJECT 71-006	1.172,846.10
BALANCE (TO BE REFUNDED)	1,269.03

STATEWIDE TOTALS FROM TITLE I ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORTS

PARTICIPANTS AND AMOUNTS PROGRAMMED

BY ACTIVITIES

FY 1971

Activities & Services	TITLE I PARTICIPANTS						AMOUNT OF TITLE I FUNDS SPENT				Average Per Pupil Expenditure
	Grade K	Grades 1-6	Grades 7-12	In School	Drop-Outs	Total	Regular Term	After Hours	Summer Term	Total	
Reading		24,911	8,532	8	6	33,457	$ 3,365,566	$	$ 169,996	$ 3,535,562	$ 105.67
Speech		14	208			222	14,453			14,453	65.10
English-Other Language Arts		531	5,923			6,454	533,802		59,767	593,569	91.97
Mathematics		2,286	4,835		6	7,127	440,949		76,347	517,296	72.58
Natural Science		253	1,117			1,370	90,710		21,803	112,513	82.13
Social Science		142	1,418			1,560	129,407		21,414	150,821	96.68
Special Activities for Handicapped		264	448	2,611	10	3,333	1,243,909			1,243,909	373.21
Elementary Education-Remedial		12,806	371	209		13,386	2,309,610		223,423	2,533,033	189.23
Pre-School Clinic	439	32				471			30,706	30,706	65.19
General Education-Early Childhood		2,297	167			2,464	365,278		11,020	376,298	152.72
Pre-Kindergarten/Kindergarten	637	14				651	157,892		70,221	228,113	350.40
Art		12,420	2,422	22		14,864	320,659		3,308	323,967	21.80
Cultural Enrichment		615	373	29		1,017	114,101		3,181	117,282	115.32
Music	170	34,112	7,642	286		42,210	916,944		7,651	924,595	21.90
Business Education			1,532			1,532	119,266		1,760	121,026	79.00
Home Economics		21	456	1		478	38,708			38,708	80.98
Industrial Arts		15	2,593			2,608	354,553			354,553	135.95

Activities & Services	TITLE I PARTICIPANTS						AMOUNT OF TITLE I FUNDS SPENT				Average Per Pupil Expenditure
	Grade K	Grades 1-6	Grades 7-12	In School	Drop-Outs	Total	Regular Term	After Hours	Summer Term	Total	
Special Crafts		307	172			479	$ 8,200	$	$ 1,101	$ 9,301	$ 19.42
Other Vocational Education			109			109	23,922			23,922	219.47
P.E./Recreation/Health		16,336	1,430	70		17,836	309,295		52,295	361,590	20.27
Speech Therapy	12	4,362	255	542		5,171	278,717		450	279,167	53.99
Other Instructional		6	756			762	32,622	3,006		35,628	46.76
TOTAL INSTRUCTIONAL							$11,168,563	$ 3,006	$ 754,443	$ 11,926,012	
Food	296	28,444	17,988	823	3	47,554	438,827		41,813	480,640	10.11
Health-Dental	78	9,483	5,405	130		15,096	208,895		1,871	210,766	13.96
Health-Medical	285	36,980	22,346	1,080	8	60,699	690,128		9,270	699,398	11.52
Social Work	281	29,546	20,383	768	57	51,035	512,958		5,901	518,859	10.17
Attendance	138	13,034	10,343	275		23,790	147,061		757	147,818	6.21
Other Pupil Services	129	24,634	12,582	592	8	37,945	379,160		5,019	384,179	10.12
Textbook Loan Service		2,357	8,863	127		11,347	135,955		390	136,345	12.02
Library	238	71,293	22,454	5,882	32	99,899	1,524,283		22,183	1,546,466	15.48
Media Center	85	24,501	12,160	204		36,950	170,861		800	171,661	4.65
Guidance Counseling	19	27,582	31,473	455	73	59,602	1,186,623		5,308	1,191,931	20.00
Testing	206	64,579	40,410	716		105,911	247,375		2,491	249,866	2.36
Psychological Services	48	910	406	322		1,686	71,124			71,124	42.19
Pupil Transportation	149	752	1,100	105		2,160	94,968		112,017	206,985	98.28

Activities & Services	TITLE I PARTICIPANTS						AMOUNT OF TITLE I FUNDS SPENT				Average Per Pupil Expenditure
	Grade K	Grades 1-6	Grades 7-12	In School	Drop-Outs	Total	Regular Term	After Hours	Summer Term	Total	
Special Services for Handicapped		41	24			65	$ 2,850	$	$	$ 2,850	$ 43.85
Student Work Study		1	157			158	21,677	386	2,476	24,539	155.31
Evening Study Center			73			73		1,487		1,487	20.37
Tutoring		44	301	7	1	353	27,712	4,959	1,100	33,771	95.67
TOTAL SUPPORTIVE							$ 5,860,457	$6,832	$ 211,396	$ 6,078,685	
Administration							1,740,634		29,212	1,769,846	
Operation of Plant							328,201		50,706	378,907	
Maintenance of Plant							198,915		10,422	209,337	
Fixed Charges							1,885,167	339	83,183	1,968,689	
TOTAL OPERATIONAL							$ 4,152,917	$ 339	$ 173,523	$ 4,326,779	
Parent Activities							2,972		70	3,042	
Inservice Training							91,231		77	91,308	
Other Special Costs							283			283	
TOTAL SPECIAL COSTS							$ 94,486		$ 147	$ 94,633	
Portable or Demountable Buildings							781,723			781,723	
Permanent Construction							506,168			506,168	

Activities & Services	TITLE I PARTICIPANTS						AMOUNT OF TITLE I FUNDS SPENT				Average Per Pupil Expenditure
	Grade K	Grades 1-6	Grades 7-12	In School	Drop-Outs	Total	Regular Term	After Hours	Summer Term	Total	
Remodeling							$ 50,009			$ 50,009	
TOTAL SCHOOL FACILITIES							$ 1,337,900			$ 1,337,900	
GRAND TOTAL							$22,614,323	$10,177	$1,139,509	$23,764,009	

NUMBER OF PROJECTS APPROVED
BY
SIZE OF DISTRICT AND SERVICES OFFERED

SIZE OF LEA'S		SIZE OF PROJECT AREAS		SCOPE OF PROJECTS		COOPERATIVE PROJECTS	
Enrollment	Total No. LEA's Filing Projects	Total Enrollment	No. Of Target Schools	Reg. Term	Both Terms	Specific Services	Total Programs
Below 100	9	593	12	9			
101 - 200	33	5,018	63	28	5		
201 - 300	46	11,323	100	38	8		
301 - 500	99	37,954	203	77	22	1	
501 - 700	46	26,485	99	31	15	1	1
701 - 1000	40	32,544	94	23	17		
1001-1500	40	50,329	113	23	17		
1501-2000	20	37,029	85	10	10		
2001-3000	19	44,180	82	12	7		
3001-5000	12	30,606	57	6	6	1	1
5001-10,000	11	54,431	95	2	9		
Over 10,000	4	37,625	70	2	2		
TOTALS	379	368,117	1,073	261	118	3	2

SIZE AND SCOPE

STATEWIDE TOTALS FROM THE
TITLE I ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORTS

FY 1971

COUNTY	DISTRICT OPERATED SCHOOLS										PROJECT AREA SCHOOLS (TARGET)									
	High		Jr. High		Middle		Elem.		Total		High		Jr. High		Middle		Elem.		Total	
	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB
Arkansas	4	1,679	1	470	1	459	11	2,514	17	5,122	4	1,679	1	470	1	459	7	1,822	13	4,430
Ashley	5	2,024	1	65	2	1,192	9	2,914	17	6,195	5	2,024	1	65	2	1,192	9	2,914	17	6,195
Baxter	4	791	1	486			6	1,489	11	2,766	4	791	1	486			5	1,386	10	2,663
Benton	7	3,329	2	576	2	1,262	14	5,210	25	10,377	7	3,329	2	576	2	1,262	14	5,210	25	10,377
Boone	5	1,273	1	636			8	2,101	14	4,010	5	1,273	1	636			8	2,101	14	4,010
Bradley	3	1,100	1	350			5	1,586	9	3,036	3	1,100	1	350			5	1,586	9	3,036
Calhoun	2	714					2	723	4	1,437	2	714					2	723	4	1,437
Carroll	3	1,048					3	1,161	6	2,209	3	1,048					3	1,161	6	2,209
Chicot	3	1,019	3	1,330	2	940	4	1,796	12	5,085	3	1,019	3	1,330	2	940	4	1,796	12	5,085
Clark	4	1,358			2	780	7	1,894	13	4,032	4	1,358			2	780	7	1,894	13	4,032
Clay	5	1,535	1	229			8	2,247	14	4,011	5	1,535	1	229			8	2,247	14	4,011
Cleburne	5	1,051					5	1,161	10	2,212	5	1,051					5	1,161	10	2,212
Cleveland	4	740					4	858	8	1,598	4	740					4	858	8	1,598
Columbia	7	1,996	2	954	1	537	7	2,178	17	5,665	7	1,996	2	954	1	537	7	2,178	17	5,665
Conway	5	1,073	2	726			9	2,035	16	3,834	5	1,073	2	726			8	1,564	15	3,363
Craighead	10	3,832	2	1,368	1	333	17	6,033	30	11,571	10	3,832	2	1,368	1	333	15	4,911	28	10,444

COUNTY	DISTRICT OPERATED SCHOOLS										PROJECT AREA SCHOOLS (TARGET)									
	High		Jr. High		Middle		Elem.		Total		High		Jr. High		Middle		Elem.		Total	
	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB
Crawford	5	2,000	1	773			11	3,349	17	6,122	5	2,000	1	773			8	2,200	14	4,973
Crittenden	6	2,646	5	2,829	1	494	14	7,402	26	13,371	4	1,408	3	1,731	1	494	10	5,024	18	8,657
Cross	3	1,598	1	779	2	1,073	5	1,779	11	5,229	3	1,598	1	779	2	1,073	5	1,779	11	5,229
Dallas	3	1,091					3	1,174	6	2,265	3	1,091					3	1,174	6	2,265
Desha	5	1,546	3	971			8	3,169	16	5,686	4	1,463	3	971			8	3,169	15	5,603
Drew	3	755	1	465	1	202	6	1,644	11	3,066	3	755	1	465	1	202	6	1,644	11	3,066
Faulkner	7	1,901	2	958			9	3,031	18	5,890	7	1,901	2	958			7	1,703	16	4,562
Franklin	5	1,168	1	200			6	1,468	12	2,836	5	1,168	1	200			6	1,468	12	2,836
Fulton	3	665					3	886	6	1,551	3	665					3	886	6	1,551
Garland	7	3,521	2	1,403			15	5,537	24	10,461	7	3,521	1	617			11	3,807	19	7,945
Grant	5	1,365					6	1,589	11	2,954	5	1,365					6	1,589	11	2,954
Greene	7	2,167			1	505	12	2,804	20	5,476	7	2,167			1	505	12	2,804	20	5,476
Hempstead	5	1,554	1	478			12	2,328	18	4,360	5	1,554	1	478			12	2,328	18	4,360
Hot Spring	5	1,704	1	797			13	2,758	19	5,259	5	1,704	1	797			9	2,338	15	4,839
Howard	4	836	1	341			4	1,439	9	2,616	4	836	1	341			4	1,439	9	2,616
Independ.	10	1,725	1	465			12	2,441	23	4,631	9	1,644	1	465			12	2,441	22	4,550
Izard	5	649					5	686	10	1,335	3	424					5	686	8	1,110
Jackson	5	1,488	2	602			7	2,406	14	4,496	5	1,488	2	602			7	2,406	14	4,496
Jefferson	9	5,424	6	3,124	6	2,325	24	9,408	45	20,281	9	5,206	5	2,372	5	1,773	21	8,382	40	17,733
Johnson	5	1,269					8	1,560	13	2,829	5	1,269					8	1,560	13	2,829

COUNTY	DISTRICT OPERATED SCHOOLS										PROJECT AREA SCHOOLS (TARGET)									
	High		Jr. High		Middle		Elem.		Total		High		Jr. High		Middle		Elem.		Total	
	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB
Lafayette	3	804			2	764	3	910	8	2,478	3	804			2	764	3	910	8	2,478
Lawrence	7	1,693					7	1,880	14	3,573	7	1,693					7	1,880	14	3,573
Lee	2	1,067	1	1,455			6	2,805	9	5,327	2	1,067	1	1,455			6	2,805	9	5,327
Lincoln	4	1,273			1	325	4	1,465	9	3,063	4	1,273			1	325	4	1,465	9	3,063
Little River	3	761	2	529	1	332	3	1,221	9	2,843	3	761	2	529	1	332	3	1,221	9	2,843
Logan	4	1,189	1	341			6	1,725	11	3,255	4	1,189	1	341			4	1,506	9	3,036
Lonoke	5	2,295			2	1,214	6	2,901	13	6,410	5	2,295			2	1,214	6	2,901	13	6,410
Madison	3	716			1	394	4	1,006	8	2,116	3	716			1	394	4	1,006	8	2,116
Marion	4	527					5	675	9	1,202	4	527					5	675	9	1,202
Miller	5	1,872	2	1,530	1	541	9	3,540	17	7,483	5	1,872	2	1,530	1	541	9	3,540	17	7,483
Miss.	11	3,776	8	2,439	1	525	21	8,741	41	15,481	10	3,451	8	2,439	1	525	17	6,652	36	13,067
Monroe	3	1,053	1	300	2	1,044	3	1,612	9	4,009	3	1,053	1	300	2	1,044	3	1,612	9	4,009
Montgomery	4	620					4	663	8	1,283	4	620					4	663	8	1,283
Nevada	7	870			1	511	7	914	15	2,295	7	870			1	511	7	914	15	2,295
Newton	4	570					5	724	9	1,294	4	570					5	724	9	1,294
Ouachita	6	2,748	1	480	1	555	9	3,356	17	7,139	6	2,748	1	480	1	555	8	3,232	16	7,015
Perry	3	431	1	142			6	764	10	1,337	3	431	1	142			5	694	9	1,267
Phillips	6	2,766	4	1,977			14	5,916	24	10,659	6	2,766	4	1,977			14	5,916	24	10,659
Pike	4	873					4	961	8	1,834	4	873					4	961	8	1,834
Poinsett	6	1,977			2	700	8	2,719	16	5,396	6	1,977			2	700	8	2,719	16	5,396

COUNTY	DISTRICT OPERATED SCHOOLS										PROJECT AREA SCHOOLS (TARGET)									
	High		Jr. High		Middle		Elem.		Total		High		Jr. High		Middle		Elem.		Total	
	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB	No.	ANB
Polk	5	875	1	401			7	1,509	13	2,785	5	875	1	401			6	1,419	12	2,695
Pope	5	1,934	1	884			9	3,300	15	6,118	4	1,584	1	884			6	2,077	11	4,545
Prairie	3	1,366					3	1,286	6	2,652	3	1,366					3	1,286	6	2,652
Pulaski	13	13,217	17	15,004	1	53	76	34,823	107	63,097	8	7,176	9	7,056	1	53	39	16,947	57	31,232
Randolph	4	821	1	363			6	1,317	11	2,501	4	821	1	363			6	1,317	11	2,501
Saline	5	1,937	3	1,610			9	3,861	17	7,408	5	1,937	2	1,046			7	2,868	14	5,851
Scott	1	301	1	386			1	846	3	1,533	1	301	1	386			1	846	3	1,533
Searcy	5	721					5	1,136	10	1,857	5	721					5	1,136	10	1,857
Sebastian	7	3,902	5	3,425			27	8,933	39	16,260	6	2,833	3	2,017			15	4,809	24	9,659
Sevier	4	950	1	334	1	233	5	1,090	11	2,607	4	950	1	334	1	233	5	1,090	11	2,607
Sharp	5	1,127					5	1,160	10	2,287	5	1,127					5	1,160	10	2,287
St. Francis	4	2,481	1	1,579			13	4,958	18	9,018	4	2,481	1	1,579			8	3,651	13	7,711
Stone	3	618	1	21			5	682	9	1,321	3	618	1	21			5	682	9	1,321
Union	8	3,570	4	1,861	1	255	19	5,600	32	11,286	8	3,570	4	1,861	1	255	15	3,994	28	9,680
Van Buren	5	851					5	865	10	1,716	5	851					5	865	10	1,716
Washington	9	4,452	4	2,822			22	8,678	35	15,952	9	4,452	3	1,997			13	4,860	25	11,309
White	11	3,188	3	778	1	203	13	4,529	28	8,698	11	3,188	3	778	1	203	13	4,529	28	8,698
Woodruff	3	971	1	237	1	414	3	1,313	8	2,935	3	971	1	237	1	414	3	1,313	8	2,935
Yell	7	1,255	1	297			7	1,709	15	3,261	7	1,255	1	297			7	1,709	15	3,261
STATEWIDE TOTALS	384	132,052	111	60,570	42	18,165	676	224,856	1,213	435,643	370	122,422	95	47,189	41	17,613	567	180,893	1,073	368,117

TOTAL TITLE I PARTICIPANTS

DATA TAKEN FROM THE FY 1971 ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

Regular Term

County	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Ungraded	Drop-Outs	Total
Arkansas	12	193	151	170	173	157	182	208	201	163	137	139	39	78		2,003
Ashley		106	216	149	105	105	161	100	83	76	75	59	48	77		1,360
Baxter		65	114	113	77	88	95	43	83	74	77	50	33	11	1	924
Benton		262	248	242	237	249	228	201	163	110	98	94	78	15		2,225
Boone	16	314	316	315	321	322	322	142	150	130	106	61	51		2	2,568
Bradley		99	88	86	83	76	85	81	81	72	54	55	43			903
Calhoun	62	38	30	32	45	34	40	29	27	42	34	36	35			484
Carroll		152	150	144	114	113	80	22	46	25	12	10	4			872
Chicot		291	259	260	269	254	249	207	194	174	120	96	95	15		2,483
Clark		182	185	174	177	183	172	114	104	126	75	68	51			1,611
Clay	44	189	178	170	141	162	163	158	135	120	91	85	60	100	34	1,830
Cleburne		93	70	83	63	103	121	111	94	74	49	44	33			938
Cleveland		53	52	58	66	67	61	69	48	41	50	41	34			640
Columbia	17	236	178	191	224	225	219	223	196	203	193	168	127	30		2,430

Title I Participants - Annual Evaluation Report - FY 1971
Regular Term

County	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Ungraded	Drop-Outs	Total
Conway		98	114	120	123	108	108	137	119	142	144	103	91	64		1,471
Craighead	42	301	286	282	274	280	269	260	253	223	282	134	108	194	10	3,206
Crawford		148	111	133	111	103	106	151	68	43	27	27	28	39		1,095
Crittenden		447	502	501	528	501	522	428	457	261	227	188	147			4,709
Cross		116	119	137	136	128	94	124	84	151	60	70	52			1,279
Dallas		66	52	55	64	53	74	53	39	50	29	45	37			617
Desha		278	260	242	238	242	249	230	222	85	60	99	88			2,293
Drew		70	98	77	89	89	80	101	81	74	68	48	47		1	923
Faulkner		65	49	44	71	54	102	178	114	71	68	70	45			931
Franklin		47	71	53	69	82	57	37	29	78	63	63	52	12		713
Fulton		59	62	70	74	58	73	84	75	35	41	28	24			683
Garland		296	224	288	318	271	291	376	370	292	520	489	496	63		4,294
Grant		22	40	87	90	48	46	94	75	27	21	28	43			621
Greene		248	210	223	208	242	229	240	246	174	176	146	108	79		2,529
Hempstead	18	90	113	163	135	116	143	107	108	135	104	138	131	44		1,545
Hot Spring		79	85	86	110	138	143	88	81	66	67	66	58			1,067
Howard		72	61	86	60	65	63	85	52	48	42	24	22	2		682
Independence	18	175	181	198	212	198	214	158	127	138	120	101	85			1,925
Izard		53	48	64	47	45	45	37	47	43	27	27	23			506

Title I Participants - Annual Evaluation Report - FY 1971
Regular Term

County	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Ungraded	Drop-Outs	Total
Jackson	40	209	201	211	222	221	187	169	206	166	169	138	110	17		2,266
Jefferson	97	772	686	975	975	937	939	672	597	482	395	344	279	365		8,515
Johnson		124	98	103	109	92	91	106	90	83	50	57	41			1,044
Lafayette		168	120	165	157	139	147	159	153	118	110	105	87			1,628
Lawrence		114	132	129	169	132	156	156	144	112	89	65	47	58	11	1,514
Lee		397	345	343	361	353	358	343	323	338	311	237	207	58		3,974
Lincoln		101	105	162	151	160	147	157	132	113	73	80	90			1,471
Little River		117	109	124	87	71	81	92	76	96	65	66	62		10	1,056
Logan		238	215	227	214	208	229	114	77	83	45	58	36	15	31	1,790
Lonoke		256	252	233	232	287	218	298	221	203	173	169	127	43		2,712
Madison		19	24	22	25	26	49	83	114	48	46	35	27		15	533
Marion	30	75	70	85	75	77	71	68	51	39	37	49	50			777
Miller	113	224	230	195	204	176	150	131	122	95	81	81	68	71		1,941
Mississippi	144	937	841	862	897	923	913	690	635	614	462	377	326	75	4	8,700
Monroe		209	255	187	208	210	201	184	186	182	181	88	109			2,200
Montgomery		26	23	23	53	67	28	23	20	26	8	11	9			317
Nevada		76	81	82	97	118	104	91	101	56	60	70	49			935
Newton	2	111	94	86	107	108	103	84	61	47	38	37	36			914
Ouachita		187	231	287	187	181	143	366	171	227	103	104	93	73		2,353

Title I Participants - Annual Evaluation Report - FY 1971
Regular Term

County	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Ungraded	Drop-Outs	Total
Perry		10	14	34	41	30	35	21	19	17	17	10	1			249
Phillips		490	471	487	526	451	460	499	377	394	189	146	113	132		4,735
Pike		61	32	46	65	25	32	18	18	20	56	49	6			428
Poinsett		314	272	263	279	264	259	228	216	181	170	141	129	73	7	2,796
Polk		69	59	49	69	74	88	92	71	50	45	57	41	12	3	779
Pope		160	154	116	123	109	116	97	79	86	51	45	38	187		1,361
Prairie		34	70	93	57	59	58	72	68	52	44	31	58		5	701
Pulaski	44	1,294	1,346	1,135	954	684	643	528	397	429	354	239	375	460		8,882
Randolph		87	114	112	112	102	107	203	184	162	103	102	79	18	6	1,491
Saline		35	22	77	58	57	23	24	27	7	35	11	7	71		449
Scott		19	35	18	18	26	37	23	32	11						219
Searcy		42	35	59	40	35	37	72	82	19	21	10	9		4	465
Sebastian		48	138	122	144	153	135	221	182	162	34	31	21		122	1,513
Sevier		28	39	46	31	30	47	38	31	25	33	27	23			398
Sharp		90	99	100	111	88	97	108	88	93	95	90	76			1,135
St. Francis		450	427	477	456	561	513	456	408	363	283	224	197	89		4,904
Stone		69	79	79	70	79	79	80	82	69	66	63	52	34	8	909
Union	88	243	202	306	304	313	279	273	269	186	158	116	80	24	1	2,842
Van Buren		27	39	55	31	34	32	72	36	25	26	35	29			441

Title I Participants - Annual Evaluation Report - FY 1971
Regular Term

County	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Ungraded	Drop-Outs	Total
Washington		263	296	315	206	191	210	210	190	127	124	99	73		30	2,334
White		213	264	228	238	223	228	239	248	197	119	79	77	9	3	2,365
Woodruff		155	158	160	142	145	147	165	208	136	150	106	145	15		1,832
Yell		130	93	86	107	94	125	101	101	77	60	56	50		1	1,081
STATE-WIDE TOTALS	787	13,694	13,491	14,060	13,764	13,280	13,188	12,502	11,140	9,582	8,054	6,838	5,948	2,722	309	139,359

TOTAL TITLE I PARTICIPANTS

DATA TAKEN FROM THE FY 1971 ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

Summer Term

County	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Ungraded	Drop-Outs	Total
Arkansas	91															91
Ashley	76	74	79	69	85	85	32	32	31	10	17	5				595
Baxter		3	1	1				5		5		1				16
Benton		1	4	8	11	1	5									30
Clay	30	10	17	15	16	10	4	2	2	1	1	2			3	113
Cleburne		4	3	5	12	18	11	5	4	16	6	7	1			92
Columbia	29		31	27	23	22	24	23	23	27						229
Conway				14	20	21	19	7	6	7	7	17	1	43		162
Craighead	49	58	59	53	53	59	52	13							4	400
Crawford		10	13	19	3	4	3									52
Crittenden		192	109	104	91	72	23	15	18	14	4	9				651
Cross				39	22	16	11									88
Desha	97	65	50	54	45	46	7	4	3	2	3					376
Drew	84															84
Faulkner		35	7	3	5		2	31	40	60	51	40	41			315
Franklin	34	9	12	12	10	15	3	12	11	14	7	4	2			145

Title I Participants - Annual Evaluation Report - FY 1971
Summer Term

County	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Ungraded	Drop-Outs	Total
Garland							22	12	20	43	23	10				130
Grant	19	9	5	3	9	6	8	8	5	7	5					84
Greene		22	34	27	32	28	17	13	16	10	9			1		209
Hot Spring				4	2	8	3	7		6	7	4				41
Howard		36	22	30	20	32	25	26	15	4	8	16	6			240
Independence	6	11	9	9	11	9	10									65
Jackson		71	72	55	71	66	55	47	41	38	44	22	16			598
Jefferson	79	46	59	86	107	81	79	89	73	42	2					743
Johnson	25	21	22	19	16	14	15	17	5							154
Lafayette		26	24	49	71	53	70	60	52	59	27	25	14			530
Lawrence		22	41	31	45	28	36	29	25	17	6	7		4		291
Lee	282															282
Lincoln	74			17	17	22	25	20	26							201
Little River								8	14	6	17	14	9		10	78
Logan	64	14	13	17	13	15	5			20	20	4	2			187
Lonoke	55	19	15	17	63	65	64	31	11	36	23	22	3			424
Madison		2	2	3	27	32	40	14	23	14	21	13	4			195
Marion						5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5			40
Miller	108	61	56	63	68	49										405
Mississippi	140	179	109	127	163	169	177	128	100	88	108	85	20			1,593

Title I Participants - Annual Evaluation Report - FY 1971
Summer Term

County	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Ungraded	Drop-Outs	Total
Monroe	40		10	10	5			33	9	48	58	31	5			249
Nevada		6	11	12	14	5	9	9	10	5	3	7	6			97
Newton	10	25	22	24	24	21	20	21	19	17	12	18	18		4	255
Ouachita	53				26	30	26	5	9							149
Perry	23															23
Phillips	580	126	161	167	191	187	177	87	85	101	82	33	7			1,984
Poinsett	43	41	42	50	29	38	31	6								280
Polk		11	11	15	12	15	9	5	8							86
Prairie	38			13	18	7										76
Pulaski		60	73	64	74	53	45	100	125	87	35	128	131			973
Saline	89			24	6	10										129
Searcy	2	9	4	10	4	10	9	13	5	10	10	6	2			94
Sebastian	44	66	65	65	87	74	54									455
Sharp	12	6	7	9	19	23	17	7	10	16	16	7				149
St. Francis	30	179	129	134	152	128	112	26	34	9	12	9	10			964
Union	42	17	29	69	34	58	32	35	28	21	34	17	10			426
Washington	15	53	40	42	30	30	37	28	17							292
White	14	13	3	7	9	8	6		5			1				66
Woodruff	78	51	22	25	40	39	39	37	37	13	19	9	3			412
Yell	25	5	19	18	20	30	31	26	28	7	1	3	2			215

Title I Participants - Annual Evaluation Report - FY 1971
Summer Term

County	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Ungraded	Drop-Outs	Total
STATE-WIDE TOTALS	2,480	1,668	1,516	1,738	1,925	1,817	1,506	1,101	998	885	703	581	318	48	21	17,305

SECTION - IV

MOST SUCCESSFUL ACTIVITIES

Narratives Taken From the Districts' FY 1971 Title I Annual Evaluation Report

A. Prairie Grove Elementary School

B. Magnet Cove School District

C. Searcy Special School District

D. Osceola School District

E. North Little Rock School District

F. Rogers Public Schools

G. Hope School District

H. El Dorado School District

I. Wynne School District

J. Bay-Brown School District

INTRODUCTION

1. Prairie Grove Elementary School

2. Contact person: Lena Sparkman, Counselor, Prairie Grove Schools
   Prairie Grove, Arkansas 72753 Phone 846-2175

3. Remedial Reading

4. Activity was initiated in 1968 and has been a yearly activity since.

5. The activity is in operation during the 1971-72 year.

NARRATIVE

1. Objective:
   Students will respond favorably to special assistance in reading.

   Remarks: While the specific gain expected was not listed in the objective for the FY 70 project a gain of one year was expected.

2. Services provided:
   Techniques vary with the individual student and their needs. Classes are limited to a maximum of eight students. The average class size was six students. Classes were held during the school day and consisted of eleven periods per day. The remedial room has many easy to read books, games, an overhead projector, record player as well as planned reading programs to meet the needs of the wide interest range and intellectual range. The atmosphere is planned for pleasantness to create a relaxed learning situation.

3. Participants:
   The basic criteria used for selection of participants is the greatest need, beginning with those two or more years below grade level, regardless of sex or age. Students are expected to gain confidence because of being able to achieve. Educational deprivation is the basis of selection.

4. Staff:
   One teacher, holding an elementary certificate with emphasis on reading comprises the staff. She is responsible for the complete instructional program but

but depends upon the elementary counselor for assistance, such as testing and special aid in learning problems.

5. Related components:

Parents of students must confer with teachers once each six weeks. Elementary counselor involvement with remedial reading students is also a component.

6. Effectiveness:

Sixty-six students were involved in the reading class. Ten of these were returned to regular class participation and were replaced with ten others. A pre and post test was given to fifty students involved, using the Betts Informal Inventory Reading Test. Some entered late and did not receive both pre and post tests. Tests were administered in late October and early May. The average gain was 1.9 grade levels in the six month period. On the surface this is a good, but average gains do not gove the true picture. Twenty-one students gained only six months, while twenty made twelve months progress, one eighteen months, seven made twenty-four months gain and one made thirty-six months progress, thus making the average gain extremely high.

7. Budget:

The total cost of the program:

Salary:	$4,900
Fixed charges:	678
Instructional materials:	475
Total Cost:	$6,053
Total Per Pupil Cost:	78

PART XII: MOST SUCCESSFUL ACTIVITY

Introduction.

Magnet Cove School District No. 8
Janet Phillips, 1424 Park, Malvern, Arkansas 72104, Telephone 332-3119
020 Reading
Activity initiated September FY 68, continued through 71
Activity being continued in FY 72

Narrative.

Objective: The children in grades 4, 5, and 6 who are educationally deprived because of low reading skills will be indentified, and scheduled in special reading instructional activities that will increase their reading skills by one grade level as measured by the SRA standardized achievement test.

Students were scheduled in classes ranging from 6 to 12 students, for 25 minutes daily, according to grade placement, and except for 6 students who returned to the normal classroom situation, were continued in these activities for the entire school year.

The teacher utilized SRA reading labs, SRA pilot libraries, Webster clinics, EDL tapes, Imperial tapes, dictionaries, special books for the teaching of reading including high interest level books, phonetic charts, records, workbooks, and considerable mimeographed material prepared by the reading teacher and from other selected sources. Supplementary to the materials were controlled readers, a listening table with tape deck, record deck, and earphones, filmstrip projector and a tape recorder.

Students were divided into sub-groups according to their common reading ability, and instructional activities were individualized as much as possible. Techniques were designed to suit the individual child and changed for him as often as was necessary to maintain his interest.

Eight non-readers ranging from grades 2 through 6 were placed in a 30-minute class daily, and given Distar instructional activities.

Guidance activities were primarily directed toward the motivation and attitude improvement of the participants of the reading program and were also conducted by the reading teacher. Considerable contact with parents was a part of the guidance program. This contact was by written communication, phone conversation, and personal interview. Relative to students, the teacher worked with group techniques and individual conferences. The teacher gave achievement tests to all students in grades 2 through 6, intelligence tests to grade 4 and other selected students, and developmental reading tests to participants of the reading program.

The 62 students selected were identified by achievement tests, reading tests, and teacher referral.

The students selected were in grades 4 through 6 with a few non-readers from the 2nd and 3rd grade levels participating with other non-readers in a Distar program for thirty minutes daily.

Eleven students selected were from poverty families, 9 were from family situations that could be characterized broken homes. The remainder came from lower middle class families who are culturally deprived and intellectually limited.

The teacher who conducted the program has 29 years elementary teaching experience, 18 hours in reading instruction, and 18 hours in guidance activities. She has a BA degree and 30 graduate hours. In addition to the reading-guidance assignment she taught 6th grade language arts one hour daily.

The teacher was assisted occasionally by the high school counselor who gave performance tests for a few selected students.

The effectiveness of the program cannot be accurately assessed until the post achievement test is given this fall. Six students were returned to the classroom situation. On the basis of the Lyons and Carnahan New Developmental Reading Test which we have a pre and post on 34 of the participants, given in April, 1970 and 1971 respectively, the following results are indicated:

8 students gained 2 or more grade levels
8 students gained 1 or more grade levels
17 students showed no gain
1 student regressed

The above results indicated that we achieved our objective with approximately 45% of the students selected.

The following factors influenced the reading activity and may account in part for a failure to attain our objective with more students.

1. Due to a loss of time necessary to the testing program which was conducted by the reading teacher, and personal illness of the teacher the total time reading activities were conducted was approximately 6½ months.

2. We have reason to doubt the measuring device since we gave a revised edition of the test as a post test.

3. Some students selected had low IQ scores which indicated they were not ideal choices for a remedial program.

4. The sequence of course content designed by the teacher places emphasis on instructional activities in the 4th grade level which seemed to not correlate well with the testing instrument used. This is the grade level where most failures occurred.

MAGNET COVE REPORT CONT'D

Title I funds provided $3936 for the reading program or for an average enrollment of 60 students, $656 per student. Using a cost per pupil of $625 for elementary children established by the auditor for the previous school year and pro-rating this for the students while they were in reading instruction, the district probably provided approximately $42 per pupil for this program. This would indicate a total per pupil expenditure of $698.

PART XII: MOST SUCCESSFUL ACTIVITY

INTRODUCTION

1. Name of Local Educational Agency: Searcy Special School District.

2. Name, address and telephone number of person who can be contacted for futher information: Phillip R. Shewmaker, 801 North Elm, Searcy, Arkansas; telephone number 268-3518.

3. Title of Activity: Remedial Reading

4. Date when Activity was initiated: Activity was initiated September 1, 1966 and is continuing to be implemented.

5. Date when Activity was terminated: Activity has not been terminated.

NARRATIVE

1. Objective

   1. Raise reading levels one to one and one-half grade level during the school year.

   2. Increase appreciation of reading to the mean appreciation of the other students.

2. Services Provided

   a. Remedial reading for students who are reading one to two grade levels below their age or grade level. These students are grouped into classes of twelve (12) to fifteen (15).

      The teachers use the same type of materials in all classes. The materials are Scott Foresman Basic Reading Text, the Webster Series developed for use as laboratory material consisting of reading films, film strips, question sheets and workbooks. Tape recorders and headsets are used for reading practice and phonetic records and charts to teach sounds.

      A combination of different techinques are employed. We generally start with a slight vocabulary to develop skills in word attack study. From the first approach to reading, interpretating the new words from context is encouraged. A variety of word study skills is introduced in the beginning and developed to the more complicated and detailed as abilities allow.

   b. The students are grouped as to his reading level. The average class size is 15.

c. Each class was divided into two groups and the following procedures were followed.

1. One group listens to records on headsets while reading the same story from their books. These records have been pre-taped by the teachers to accompany stories in the students book.

2. The other group has an oral reading lesson. Since the first group is using the headsets, the two groups do not conflict. Any words the group had trouble pronouncing are written on the board by the teacher. The words are broken into syllables for better understanding.

3. The next step for the entire group is a reading lesson on the controlled reading machine. This machine flashes one word at a time on a screen at a certain speed; and example might be four words per-minute. The words are never spoken. A student must be able to read to be able to understand the story. After students finish reading from this machine, they are tested.

4. The next exercise for the student is a session with the phonetic records. As they listen to these records, the teacher uses a chart to show the student what each word resembles. The charts are made by the teachers before class time. They correspond with the record the students are listening to.

5. Students are encouraged to read library books. Books are available for the students to check from the library.

d. Equipment and materials used in the project consist of instructional and library materials and books written on the students' level, globes, maps, reading machines, controlled readers, SRA Reading Lab and filmstrips.

e. Clothing, medical and dental care, and supplies were furnished for the students whose parents are unable financially, to provide these services.

3. Participants

Individual conferences were held with the students' reading teachers to help determine the needs of each student. All students were given the Nelson Reading Test, Revised Edition. Then the participants were selected according to teacher recommendations as to reading abilities and test scores. The number of participants in the remedial reading program in the regular school term was 125 in the elementary and 54 in the secondary school. Ages of the students range from six to fourteen years. Sex of the students is about the same number of boys and girls. The students are educationally deprived students and about 96% are from economically deprived homes.

4. Staff

   The staff consist of five certified remedial reading teachers.

5. Related Compontents: Does not apply.

6. Effectiveness

   The remedial reading students advanced one half to one grade level per year.

7. Budget

   Regular school term, $38,038 for remedial reading for 179 students. This equals $212 per stuoent. The $212 per students is the amount spent from the ESEA Title I funds.

PART XII: MOST SUCCESSFUL ACTIVITY

1. Name of local educational agency: Osceola School District #1

2. Contact Person: John H. Barker, Director of Instruction
P.O. Box 628
Osceola, Arkansas 72370

Telephone 501-563-5600

3. Title of Activity: Speech and Hearing

4. Date initiated: September, 1970

5. Date terminated: This activity is being continued through FY '72

Narrative

The speech and hearing services were provided as a result of a contract with the Memphis Speech and Hearing Center of Memphis State University. Their final report is enclosed.

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY
Department of [illegible] and Speech Pathology

Memphis Speech and Hearing Center
807 Jefferson Avenue
Memphis, Tennessee 38105

August 31, 1971

OSCEOLA SCHOOLS SPEECH & HEARING PROJECT

MISSISSIPPI COUNTY, ARKANSAS

Final Report
September 1, 1970 - August 31, 1971

IDENTIFICATION ACTIVITIES

Because speech clinical services had not been previously offered in the Arkansas area of concern, it was considered desirable to begin the program by screening all children in grades 1 through 12. This was initiated in September, 1970, and was completed in December, 1970. Table 1, Initial Screening Data, Presents the number of children screened and classified by sex and by race.

TABLE I. Initial Screening Data, as of January 30, 1971.

Sex			Race		
	Number	Percentage		Number	Percentage
Male	1,262	51.01	Black	1,200	48.50
Female	1,198	48.43	White	1,251	50.57
Error	14	.56	Other	5	.20
			Error	18	.73
Total	2,474	100.00	Total	2,474	100.00

In the initial screening, all children were given an articulation test, a pure tone screening test, and measures of spontaneous speech that included evaluation of stuttering, voice quality, and general intelligibility. Any child who made one or more errors on any part of this screening batter was designated as flagged.

In addition, if a teacher, parent, or other person made specific reference to the communicative problems of the child, he was also flagged. The term flagged, then, should not be interpreted as necessarily meaning that the child needs therapy. Rather, it simply means that either because of some deviation - insignificant or significant - in his communicative behavior or because of a referral, he would be looked at again.

TABLE II. Children Flagged and Cleared.

Category	Number	Percentage
Flagged	960	38.80
Cleared	1,514	61.20
Total	2,474	100.00

FOLLOW UP SCREENING PROCEDURES

The initial flagging, it will be remembered, identified individuals who (1) deviated even if very slightly on any one of the test items or who (2) were referred to by teachers, parents, or other adults as having a communicative problem. The plan, therefore, was to see each of the flagged children again, but at no time was it expected that each of these children would require therapy. The major follow up screening procedures will be reviewed separately.

HEARING SCREENING

The pure tone screening test was administered at 500, 1,000, 2,000 and 6,000 Hz at 20 dB level. The child was flagged if he failed to hear any one of the test frequencies in either ear. Table III, Data on Pure Tone Screening, gives the results for this portion of the screening process. Because of the relatively high noise level in typical school testing situations, a high percentage of children fail a pure tone screening test despite the fact that their hearing may acctually be normal. Futhermore, colds at the time of testing may result in a transitory hearing loss. For the reason, it has become customary to administer a second screening routinely to those children who failed the first screening. The children who fail the second screening then receive a pure tone threshold test under relatively ideal acoustical circumstances. In this instance, the children were transported to the Memphis Speech and Hearing Center for this test. As is indicated in Table III, 321 children failed the first screening, 138 failed the second screening. Of these 138 children, 93 were given a pure tone threshold test. Of the 36 children who failed the test, 13 were diagnosed by an otologist as having an organic hearing condition warranting immediate medical treatment.

TABLE III. Pure Tone Screening.

	1st Screening	2nd Screening	Pure Tone Threshold
Failed	321	138	93
Passed	2,085	241	61
Unsatisfactory	47		
Error	2		
Total	2,474		

VOICE SCREENING

During the initial screening 20 children were flagged as demonstrating voice difficulties. These children were then seen again by a therapist, who was unaware of the original evaluation, and by the supervising clinician. On the basis of these three opinions 10 children were considered to have significant voice problems. It was recommended that these children be seen by an otolaryngologist for medical evaluation before initiating therapy. A list of these children is enclosed with this report. Table IV, Voice Screening, shows the number children identified as having voice problems.

TABLE IV. Voice Screening.

School	1st Screening	2nd Screening
Rosenwald High School	2	1
Rosenwald Elementary School	8	4
West Elementary School	7	3
Osceola Junior High School	3	2
Total	20	10

ARTICULATORY SCREENING

The Triota Articulation Test was administered to all of the children. Some 584 children missed at least 1 of the 54 items on the Triota. Each of these children was, therefore, included in the flagged group. An articulation score, based upon the number of items missed, age of child, and type of error, was computed for each child. In general, subject to other factors, children with a Triota score of 10 or more manifested articulation deviations severe enough to justify consideration for articulatory therapy. This would include about 5% of the population. Articulatory Data are shown in Table V.

TABLE V. Articulatory Screening Data.

	Number	Percentage
Failed	584	23.61
Cleared	1,890	76.39
Total	2,474	100.00

THERAPY

Therapy began in the month of January, with all of the children selected for therapy having articulatory problems being placed in the Paired Stimuli program. Children having other types of communicative disorders as well as those who were unable to meet criterion for paired stimuli, were placed in traditional therapy situation.

School buses were used to transport the children to the Speech and Hearing Center located at Osceola Junior High School. The selected group from each school came at different times everyday. This was done to prevent a child from being absent from classroom work during the same hour each day. Each child was seen three times per week.

Table VI, Paired Stimuli Data, shows the children seen in the Paired Stimuli program numbered 69. Of these, 49 completed the program on one or more sounds. Nine were unable to complete the program. It should be noted that the average number of therapy sessions for a child in the Paired Stumuli articulatory program was 10, or an average total of 70.18 minutes per remission of sound. A child averaged 2 to 3 sessions per day or approximately 4 days per sound.

TABLE VI. Paired Stimuli Data

Number completing program, at least 1 sound	69	Number completing all sounds	49
Number failed	9	Number needing aditional sounds	26
Total	78	Total	75

In the traditional therapy program 15 children were enrolled and 2 were dismissed as needing no futher therapy. Thirty-one additional children were recommended for traditional therapy. Table VII, Traditional Therapy, shows the number of children enrolled or recommended for traditional therapy according to the type of communicative disorder.

TABLE VII. Traditional Therapy.

	Articulation	Language	Stutterer	Articulation & Language
Enrolled	8	3	2	2
Completed	2	0	0	0
Need More Therapy	6	3	2	2
Recommended	20	4	5	2

SUMMER PROGRAM

Some 100 letters requesting children attend the summer therapy program were issued. These included the children with linguistic differences, children who received no therapy during the academic year and children with severe speech and language problems from all schools served. Primarily because of transportation difficulities only 19 children were enrolled in the summer program. Table VIII, Summer Program, shows the number of children enrolled in the summer program according to school and type of communicative problem.

TABLE VIII. Summer Program.

	Disorder				
	Articulation	Voice	Stutterer	Hearing	Language
School					
East Elementary	5				1
West Elementary	4		1		
Rosenwald Elementary	3				1
Osceola Junior High	2				
Osceola High	1				
Rosenwald High			1		

Memphis Speech and Hearing Center's speech screening results indicate chat the following students have a suspected voice problem which necessitates a laryngeal examination.

West Elementary - 5

Rosenwald Elementary - 8

Rosenwald High - 2

Osceola Junior High - 1

Osceola High School - 3

THERAPY LISTS. Paired Stimuli (PS).

These lists are arranged alphabetically according to school. Each child enrolled in PS is listed and the sound or sounds actually selected for therapy. Under the heading of Disposition, "C" indicates completion of therapy for that child; "I" indicates that speech therapy as yet, is incomplete and that the child has additional sounds which need remediation.

EAST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Name	Grade	Sound	Time	Sessions	Disposition
	3	s	45	8	C
	4	s	105	14	C
	2	s	45	6	C
	1	th,s	185	15	I
	6	s	35	6	C
	5	s	35	5	C
	1	f	165	20	I
	1	th	110	8	C
	2	s,th	65	7	I
	1	sh	75	15	C
	2	th	50	5	C
	6	s	115	8	C
	3	th	70	12	C
	4	s	55	9	I
	3	sh	105	11	I
	5	s	30	5	C
	2	sh	25	6	I
	1	ch	90	17	C
	3	s	45	7	C
	4	ch	115	15	C
	4	s	55	8	C

WEST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Name	Grade	Sound	Time	Sessions	Disposition
	1	th	155	12	C
	6	s	55	4	C
	4	th	70	7	C
	3	s	35	9	C
	2	th,s	145	11	C
	4	s	25	5	C
	3	s	60	11	I
	1	th,s	160	18	I
	3	s	30	5	C
	5	s	40	5	C
	3	s	130	13	C
	2	s	70	7	C
	1	ch	45	6	C
	1	th	115	11	I
	3	s	100	14	C
	6	s	125	13	I
	4	s	30	6	C
	4	f,s	175	11	I
	1	th,ch	35	7	I
	2	s,th	125	18	C
	1	f	55	6	I
	4	s	40	9	I
	3	s,th	105	10	C
	2	sh	55	6	I
	2	sh	140	9	I

ROSENWALD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Name	Grade	Sound	Time	Sessions	Disposition
	4	s	160	20	I
	1	s	55	5	I
	4	s	60	10	I
	2	s	95	19	I
	4	s	75	10	I
	1	s	75	9	C
	4	s	80	20	C
	1	th	165	16	C
	3	sh	85	13	C
	5	s	40	9	C
	3	s,ch	195	16	I
	4	s	65	9	C
	5	th,s	105	7	C
	4	th	85	7	C
	2	k,th	90	10	I
	3	s	50	9	C

ROSENWALD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Name	Grade	Sound	Time	Sessions	Disposition
	2	s	30	6	I
	6	s	75	18	C
	2	th	65	4	C
	3	th	145	12	I
	3	ch	50	11	I

Traditional Therapy

The enclosed lists are alphabetical according to school and included each child enrolled in or recommended for traditional therapy. Also included are the types of problem, grade, and indication for need of futher therapy.

EAST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Name	Grade	Problem	Referred	Need Additional Therapy
	4	Artic	X	
	6	Artic		X
	1	Artic		X
	2	Artic	X	
	1	Artic	X	
	1	Artic	X	
	5	Artic/lang		X
	1	Artic/lang		X
	5	Artic/lang		X
	1	Artic	X	
	1	Artic	X	
	5	Artic	X	
	5	Artic	X	
	5	Artic	X	

Osceola School Speech & Hearing Project
Final Report

Traditional Therapy

ROSENWALD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Name	Grade	Problem	Referred	Need Additional Therapy
	1	Artic	X	
	3	Artic/Lang	X	
	5	Voice	X	
	3	Artic/Voice	X	
	3	Artic		X
	5	Artic	X	
	6	Artic/Lang		X
	4	Artic	X	
	3	Artic/Lang	X	
	1	Artic	X	

Traditional Therapy

WEST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

NAME	Grade	Problem	Referred	Need Additional Therapy
	SE	Artic/Lang	XX	
	4	Artic	X	
	5	Artic		X
	5	Artic/Stutterer		X
	1	Artic	X	
	4	Artic	X	
	SE	Lang		X
	SE	Lang	X	
	6	Stutterer	X	
	1	Artic	X	
	SE	Lang	X	
	1	Artic/Lang	X	

OSCEOLA JUNIOR HIGH

Name	Grade	Problem	Referred	Needs Additional Therapy
	8	Artic	X	
	7	Artic	X	
	9	Artic/Voice	X	
	8	Hearing/Artic	X	
	9	Artic/Lang	X	
	9	Artic	X	
	9	Artic	X	
	9	Artic/Lang	X	
	7	Artic	X	
	8	Artic	X	
	7	Artic	X	
	7	Lang	X	
	9	Stutterer	X	
	9	Artic/Lang	X	
	8	Artic		
	9	Artic/Lang	X	
	8	Artic/Lang	X	
	7	Artic/Lang	X	
	7	Artic/Lang	X	
	8	Voice	X	

OSCEOLA HIGH SCHOOL

Name	Grade	Problem	Referred	Needs Additional Therapy
	12	Voice		X
	12	Artic/Lang	X	
	12	Artic	X	
	11	Artic/Lang	X	
	10	Voice	X	
	10	Artic/Lang	X	
	10	Artic	X	
	10	Artic	X	
	10	Artic	X	

ROSENWALD HIGH SCHOOL

Name	Grade	Problem	Referred	Needs Additional Therapy
	10	Artic	X	
	10	Artic	X	
	7	Stutterer	X	
	10	Artic	X	
	8	Stutterer	X	
	8	Lang/Artic	X	
	10	Stutterer	X	
	10	Stutterer	X	
	7	Stutterer	X	
	7	Stutterer/Artic	X	
	8	Artic	X	
	9	Stutterer	X	
	8	Artic	X	
	7	Voice	X	
	7	Stutterer	X	
	9	Stutterer	X	
	7	Stutterer	X	
	8	Artic	X	
	10	Artic	X	
	10	Artic/Lang	X	
	10	Artic/Lang	X	
	8	Voice	X	
	7	Artic	X	
	10	Artic	X	
	9	Artic		
	7	Artic	X	
	8	Artic/Lang	X	

Budget

The total expenditure for the speech and hearing activity was $46,167. Of this amount $42,028 was paid to Memphis State University for its services, $741 was spent for new equipment, $108 bought consumable materials, $2,300 was used to secure consultants, and $990 was used for other activity costs.

All students (3,474 were screened for both speech and hearing defects). Therapy was provided for 178 children. The pupil cost (figured by including the number screened for speech, the number screened for hearing and the number who received therapy) was $9.00. Including only those who received therapy, the per pupil cost was $259.00.

NORTH LITTLE ROCK SCHOOL DISTRICT

MOST SUCCESSFUL ACTIVITY

INTRODUCTION

Name----------North Little Rock School District

Contact Person-----Andrew C. Power, Assistant Superintendent-
Educational Projects
2700 Poplar Street, North Little Rock, Arkansas

Activity----------Speech Therapy

Dates----------Initiated 1966
Termination-This Activity is planned for next year

NARRATIVE

1. Objective of Activity

Remediation of defective sounds and improvement of speech and language in general.

2. Services Provided

The two speech therapists worked with children in small groups made up of not more than five children in each group. Only the children who had very severe problems were seen individually. Each therapist worked with approximately ten groups per day. Eighty to ninety children received speech therapy from each therapist two days per week for thirty minute sessions. Most of these children were enrolled in therapy for the entire school year.

Approximately 350 first graders were involved in a speech improvement program. Each therapist worked in alternated schools first grade classroom. The therapist presented auditory training for speech sounds by using stimulation and imitation. Each child was given the opportunity to participate actively.

An eclectic approach to therapy was used by both therapists. Some of the techniques utilized with the children were:

1. stimulation and imitation
2. ear training
3. moto-kinesthetic approach
4. tongue exercises
5. phonetic placement
6. modification of other sounds
7. use of key words
8. nonsense syllables

9. signal practice
10. negative practice
11. mirror practice
12. drill
13. simultaneous writing and speaking
14. use of speech books containing worksheets designed to meet the individual needs.

Each speech therapy lesson was built around creative activities that were designed to stimulate the child to use his newly acquired sound in meaningful communication. Some of the equipment and materials used in these creative activities included: a Language Master, tape recorders, Peabody Language Development Kit, Ideal Consonant and Blend Picture Cards, Wordmaking Cards, Go Mo Picture Cards and various motivational aids, such as puzzles, colored toothpicks, Lotto games, Speech-O, Auto Race game boards and etc.

3. Participants

Six elementary schools were included in the speech therapy program, with one therapist working in two schools and the other therapist in four schools. A total of 181 students received therapy during the school year. Their ages ranged from six to fifteen and the grade levels included one through six. Of the total case load, approximately one third were female and two thirds were male.

The therapist who worked in the two largest schools screened all of the children in grades one through four and worked from teacher referrals in grades five and six. A therapy program had been offered in these schools during 1966-67, but was discontinued the intervening three years.

The therapist who worked in the other four schools screened all of the first grade children, worked from teacher referrals in grades two through six, and included those children who were carried over from the previous year. Each of these schools have been included in the speech therapy program since school year 1966-67.

In selecting children for placement in speech therapy such factors as grade and school placement, severity of the problem and the ability to benefit from the training were all considered. Only those children who exhibited very severe deviations of speech were chosen from the first grade since all first grade children recieve speech improvement in the classrooms.

The majority of the children came from underprivileged backgrounds. Some of the children exhibited behavioral problems and were being seen by the school counselor. Several of the children were included in the remedial reading program in their schools and some of them received health and social services.

4. Staff

Eva Jo Cates------MSE State College of Arkansas, 36 post graduate hours Southern Illinois, Arkansas state certificate in speech therapy, 3 years as public school speech therapist.

Betty Autry-------MA in speech therapy from University of Alabama, certificate of Clinical Competence with American Speech and Hearing Association, ten years experience as public school speech therapist.

5. Related Components

Each therapist conferred periodically with the teachers of the children enrolled in speech therapy, keeping them informed on which sounds the children were working on, the progress each child was experiencing in therapy and ways they could help the children in the classroom. Some inservice training sessions for teachers were conducted by one therapist in the schools in which she worked. Very limited contacts with parents of the participants took place.

6. Effectiveness

Two methods were used by each of the therapist to measure the effectiveness of the activity.

Early in the school year a tape recording was made of each child's speech. Words were selected which illustrated the particular deviation exhibited by each child. Late in the year another recording was made on the child's speech using the same words. It was possible in many instances to hear the changes in speech patterns which occured during therapy.

The other method was the use of pre and post testing. One therapist used the Photo Articulation Test and the other therapist used the Henja-Bryngleson Articulation Test. The pretesting was done during the first month of the school year and the post testing was done during the 34th and 35th weeks of the school year. The data on the test results indicated that many of the children involved remediated one defective sound and some improved on more than one sound. It is felt that due to this remediation of defective sounds, speech, in general, was improved appreciably.

7. Budget

Per pupil Cost----------	Salary	$74.56
	Other	9.66

Part XII MOST SUCCESSFUL ACTIVITY

Introduction.

1. Rogers Public Schools
2. Joe Mathias, Rogers Public Schools, 636-7454
3. Practical Education at the Middle School
4. Initiated 1968-69 school year
5. The Activity will continue this coming school year, 1971-72

Narrative.

1. Objective of Activity:

   a. To provide a functional math program for approximately 108 disadvantaged Junior High Students that will enable them to raise their math achievement level one year as measured by a standardized achievement test.

   b. To provide a practical Social Studies program for approximately 108 disadvantaged Junior High Students that will enable them to raise their Social Studies achievement level one year as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement test.

   c. To provide remedial reading instruction to ninty disadvantaged Junior High Students whose functioning level in reading is two years or more below their capacity level for reading and to raise their functional reading levels one year or more as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test.

2. Services Provided:

   a. The math program is a part of a total academic program. The total program provides an exemplary prevocational academic curriculm for approximately 108 disadvantaged Junior High School Students. The program takes innovative approaches in working with the disadvantaged who often have negative attitudes toward the traditional school curriculum and who find little reason for staying in school. The students are in six groups of approximately 18 each. One group is a special education group of EMR students. Each student proceeds at his own rate and works on those skills in which he is deficient. They are not graded in competition with other students,

only with themselves and their ability. No textbooks are used as such in any of the classes. The teacher makes her own materials, uses a wide variety of liquid duplicating materials, many audio-visual aids, and other supplementary materials that are interesting, timely, and provocative. The students attend this class each day of the week for a fifty five minute period.

b. The Social Studies program is also a part of a total academic program for disadvantaged students.

The total program provides an exemplary prevocational academic curriculum for approximately 108 disadvantaged Junior High School students. The program takes innovative approaches in working with the disadvantaged who often have negative attitudes toward the traditional school curriculum and who find little reason for staying in school.

The students are in six groups of approximately 18 each. Three classes are 8th graders. Each student proceeds at his own rate and works on those skills he is deficient. They are not graded in competition with other students, only with themselves and their ability. No textbooks are used as such in any of the classes. The teacher makes her own materials uses a wide variety of liquid duplicating materials, many audio-visual aids, and other supplementary materials that are interesting, timely, and provocative.

The social studies teacher supplemented instruction and provided motivation to a prevocational unit by having resource people from the community. These have included a Social Security representative, two attorneys, an Employment Security representative, a Chamber of Commerce representative, a Probation Officer, to name but a few. She has also supplemented the unit with many field trips to various agencies and industries to see the contribution they make to the community as well as job opportunities. The classes are not only learning social studies information and study skills but also the students are learning and becoming more social competent as a result of some of these experiences.

The students attend this class each day of the week for a fifty-five minute period.

c. The reading teacher tested all students recommended to her by teachers, principals, or parents, with individual reading tests both informal and standardized. She then worked out an individual program for the students chosen on the bases of need, taking into consideration the individual needs of every student.

She worked with six classes of fifteen pupils for a period of fifty-five minutes each day of the week. The teacher started where each student was and built security and confidence. She started at a sufficiently easy level so that the student could feel success and learn that reading is a pleasurable experience.

She also did corrective teaching with any individuals who were missing any skills that had already been taught. The program strived to help build attitudes toward reading that will help the disadvantaged students accept himself and his problems.

3. Participants:

Approximately 120 student participants were chosen from teachers, counselor, or principal recommendations. Some of the following criteria is considered in making any recommendations.

(a) Reading level--two years or more below grade placement
(b) Academic retardation of one or more years in other subjects
(c) Negative attitude
(d) Poor school adjustment
(e) Poor attendance
(f) Lack of interest in school and learning
(g) A history of behavioral problems
(h) One or more years older than class peers
(i) A history of mobility

Near the end of each school year teachers and principals turn in their list of recommended students to the counselor-coordinator. Selection of students for the following school year is then made from the list of recommended participants by pulling each student's cummulative record and examining achievement scores, ability scores, information on home and family background, and any other pertinent information. In any questionable cases psychological tests are administered, such as the Wechsler scales, the WISC and the WAIS, or the Stanford Binet. Parents of selected children are then given notification by mail. The letter tells briefly about the program and selection. If the parents have any questions they are invited to come by the school or call. In many cases, parents hear about the program and come by or call asking for their child or children to participate. Each year there has been quite a long waiting list of students that the school is unable to work with because of financial limitations.

4. Staff:

Six teachers and a counselor-coordinator worked full time in the project. Three teachers and the coordinator's salaries are paid with Title I Funds.

The Counselor-coordinator holds a Masters Degree in Guidance and Counseling and has fifteen hours in Special Education and Administration beyond the Masters. He has seven years teaching experience. His function and responsibilties consist of coordinating the program and counseling students.

The reading teacher holds a Masters in reading and has three years experience.

The Social Studies teacher has a B.S. Degree in Education with certification in social studies and has two years teaching experience.

The math teacher holds a B.S.E. Degree and has 27 hours of advanced work in special education. She has three years of teaching experience.

5. Related Components:

Staff Members were involved in in-service meetings once a month during the school year.

6. Effectiveness:

The program has helped to hold many students who would normally have dropped out because of continuous frustrations in their attempts to succeed in areas of value and importance to them. Even though the mean IQ for the group was in the lower 80's the following mean growth was observed by the Metropolitan Achievement test for all the participating 7th and 8th grade students.

Reading:
Sept., 4.48 mean Gr. Eq. - May, 5.88 mean Gr. Eq. Growth during the school year 1.40 Gr. Eq.

Math:
Sept., 5.86 mean Gr. Eq. - May, 6.39 mean Gr. Eq. Growth during the school year .53 Gr. Eq.

7. Budget:

	Salaries	Other	Supportive Services
Title I	$ 23,450.00	$ 360.00	$ 350.00
Local Funds	24,000.00	500.00	100.00

Approximately	110 students
Total expenditures	$ 48,760.00
Per-Pupil cost	443.00

PART XII: MOST SUCCESSFUL ACTIVITY

I. INTRODUCTION

1. LEA NAME

Hope School District 1-A

2. CONTACT PERSON NAME

Jack Beaty, Coordinator of Federal Programs
P.O. Box 688
Hope, Arkansas 71801

Telephone: 501-777-5773

3. TITLE OF ACTIVITY

023 Mathematics - PDC

4. DATE INITIATED

September 1, 1970

5. DATE TERMINATED

Project will be continued during FY 72

II. NARRATIVE

A. Program Objectives

1. The pupils will increase their application in mathematics as measured by the arithmetic subtest of Iowa Test of Basic Skills

2. The pupils will respond positively to the activity as measured by:

a. Staff-made feedback questionnaire

b. Student attendance

B. Services

The need for a program at the junior high school level to help educationally disadvantaged students strengthen their basic skills has long been recognized by the Hope school staff. The staff envisioned such a program as a means of reducing pupil dropout and an aid in preparing pupils for the world of work. The Perusal Development Center was planned in the 1969-70 school year and was implemented at Yerger

Junior High School in September, 1970. The emphasis in the program was on finding effective techniques and materials to use in improving the educational achievement of the educationally disadvantaged.

Both language arts and mathematics were included in the PDC curriculum. The report is on the mathematics component only.

Seventy-four seventh and eighth grade pupils were organized in five fifty-five munute periods during the regular school term of FY 71 for remedial instruction in arithmetic. Class sizes ranged from a minumum of seven and a maximum of twelve pupils were enrolled in the activity at one time. There was some turnover in pupil personnel due to twenty-three pupils being returned to the regular classroom at the end of the first semester of school because their application had progressed to the point that they could resume regular classroom instruction and there were four pupils who moved out of the district. As pupils were removed from the activity, others were selected to replace them.

In the textbook-Base Methodology of Individualized Instruction, the core learning material was the mathematics textbook series, grades 1-8 published by Silver-Burdett. Each student was placed in a chapter appropriate to his learning level and began studying mathematics in his textbook. Such placement was determined through the use of teacher-made tests based on sections of the textbooks in the series. Students made use of supplementary learning aids such as the mathematics section of the System 80 series, Filmstrips and cassette tapes of the imperial mathematics series. The teacher supplied information and guidance upon request or as he recognized the need.

Each pupil evaluated his learning each learning segment by writing answers to textbook exercise and checking his response with those in the teacher's edition of the text.

No restrictions were placed on students concerning the rate of learning expected, the number of the grade levels of the textbook used or the number of grade levels of textbooks which any student could complete.

A regular classroom was provided in the school building for the conduct of the program. The teacher had access to an overhead projector, System 80 and Dukane teaching machines, filmstrips and tapes, and numerous supplementary aids at each learning level.

The school social worker was instrumental in coordinating the service for the economically deprived pupils involved in this activity. The school nurse administered to their health needs, including screening of hearing and visual capabilities. Forty-seven of the pupils were given a free school lunch daily, five were furnished clothing, and one was frunished eye glasses. Eleven of the pupils were also involved in the language arts segment of the PDC.

C. Participants

There was a total of seventy-four pupils involved in the activity. Forty-six of these were seventh grade and twenty-eight were eight grade students. In the seventh grade 57% were male and 43% female, 60% Negro and 40% Caucasian, and 68% were from economically deprived homes. In the eighth grade 64% were male and 36% female, 57% Negro and 43% Caucasian, and 68% were from economically deprived homes. The age range of these students was from thirteen to sixteen years.

Students were identified and selected for the program in the following:

1. The Iowa Test of Basic Skills was administered in April, 1970 to students who would be entering grades seven and eight the following school year by the ESEA-I counselor.

2. Students who were one or more years below grade level were identified.

3. All students whose specific item scores showed them to be in need of specific remedial help were identified.

4. Classroom teachers recommended pupils for the program.

5. Students asked for admission.

6. A review committee selected those individuals who were admitted to the activity using information obtained in 1 through 5 above.

D. Staff

The teacher for this activity was a Negro male holding a Bachelor's degree from Philander Smith College with a major in mathematics. He is certified by the State Department of Education to teach secondary mathematics. He had four years experience in the local secondary schools teaching secondary mathematics prior to his being employed for this program. He aided each pupil in selecting the materials most appropriate for his achievement level, administered tests, maintained individual folders for each pupil, and counseled pupils in selecting supplementary materials for reinforcement of specific skills.

E. Related Components

The extent of parent involvement was not as great as had been planned or anticipated. Four parents visited the classroom, seven other parents came to the school for parent-teacher conferences and there were ten telephoned conferences between teacher and parents.

Inasmuch as class sizes were small, a teacher aide was not employed for this activity.

The teacher had participated in an ESEA-1 summer school in FY 70 for educationally deprived students in which individualized instructional methods and techniques were used exclusively. Many hours of inservice training were conducted for that activity by the staff of Region VIII Educational Service Center. During the current year the teacher attended a six hour workshop on using the Textbook-Base Methodology of Individualized Instruction presented to secondary teachers of the local system by the Education Service Center staff sponsored by ESA-45. He also attended a workshop conducted by Dr. Audrey Norris of Schools of Tommorow Today, which was devoted to individualizing instruction.

F. Effectiveness

1. The extent to which pupils increased their knowledge of math was measured by the arithmetic sub-test of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. Table 1 shows the result of this measurement.

Table 1. Scores obtained on pre and post tests on the arithmetic sub-test of ITBS by seventh and eighth grade students in the PDC for an average of 4.3 months special study.

Grade	Ave. Grade Equiv. Pre-Test April, 1970	Ave. Grade Equiv. Post-Test April, 1971	Ave. Gain (G.E.)
7th N = 36	4.68	5.61	0.93
8th N = 18	5.13	6.38	1.25
Total	4.83	5.86	1.04

A comparison was made of scores obtained by pupils who had received special help in the seventh and eighth grades. Table 2 shows the results of this comparison.

Table 2. A comparison of scores obtained by students recieving special help in the PDC with scores obtained by all students in the seventh and eighth grades on the arithmetic subtest of the ITBS.

Grade or Group	Ave. G.E. Pre-Test April, 1970		Ave. G.E. Post-Test April, 1971	Ave. G.E (G.E.)
7th PDC N = 36	4.68		5.61	.93
7th Total N = 213	6.09	N = 220	7.36	1.27
8th PDC N = 18	5.13		6.38	1.25
8th Total N = 231	6.95	N = 222	7.72	.77
Total PDC N = 54	4.83		5.86	1.04
Total 7th & 8th School Enrollment	6.53		7.54	1.01

As can be seen from Table 2, students receiving special help in PDC made slightly more gain in learning than did students in the total school enrollment. To compare gains by students in PDC with their past growth in regular classrooms without this special program, pre-test average scores were divided by the number of years the student had been in school to obtain previous average gain. This average was compared with the gain obtained during the present school year when PDC help was available. The results of this comparison are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. PDC average gains compared with previous gains in regular arithmetic classes.

Grade	Ave. G.E. Pre-Test	Ave. Years In School	Ave. G.E. Post-Test	Ave. Prev. Yr. Gain	Current Gain	Difference
7th	4.68	6	5.61	.78	.93	.15
8th	5.13	7	6.38	.73	1.25	.52
Total	4.83	6.5	5.86	.76	1.04	.28

As can be seen from Table 3, students receiving help in the PDC were able to attain approximately three months increase in arithmetic learning over previous learning gains without such help.

To determine how many students had benefited from PDC help, a breakdown of individual scores was constructed showing how many students gained and how many lost. Table 4 shows this breakdown.

Table 4. A gain-loss chart of student scores obtained on pre- and post tests in arithmetic on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills.

Grade Equivalent Intervals	7th Grade Gain	7th Grade Loss	8th Grade Gain	8th Grade Loss	Total Gain	Total Loss
0 - .3	6	1	6	0	7	1
.4 - .6	4	2	4	0	8	2
.7 - .9	4	2	1	0	5	2
1.0 - 1.2	2	0	4	0	6	0
1.3 - 1.5	3	0	1	0	4	0
1.6 - 1.8	1	0	2	0	3	0
1.9 - 2.1	3	1	2	0	5	1
2.2 - 2.4	1	0	1	0	2	0
2.5 - 2.7	5	0	1	0	6	0
2.8 - 3.0	1	0	0	0	1	0
3.1 - 3.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
3.4 - 3.6	0	0	1	0	1	0
TOTALS	30	6	18	0	48	6

A further comparison was made between gains on the total composite score (all areas) of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills by students who received help in the PDC and the total school enrollment of students in the 7th and 8th grades. Table 5 shows the results of this comparison.

Table 5 shows the economic condition, race, sex and pre and post test score of each participant.

PDC-MATHEMATICS
SEVENTH GRADE PARTICIPANTS
ITBS-STANDARDIZED TEST DATA

Name	Eco. Dep.	Race	Sex	Arithmetic G.E. Pre 4'70	Arithmetic G.E. post 4'71	Change	Composite G.E. Pre 4'-70	Composite G.E. Post 4'-71	Change
		W	F	46	50	+04	49	56	+07
		W	F	38	N.T.	-	40	N.T.	-
		W	F	N.T.	N.T.	-	N.T.	N.T.	-
		N	M	44	50	+06	44	49	+05
		N	F	52	64	+12	46	50	+04

PDC - MATHEMATICS
SEVENTH GRADE PARTICIPANTS
ITBS-STANDARDIZED TEST DATA

Name	Eco. Dep.	Race	Sex	Arithmetic G.E. Pre 4-'70	Arithmetic G.E. Post 4-'71	Arithmetic G.E. Change	Composite G.E. Pre 4-'70	Composite G.E. Post 4-'71	Composite G.E. Change
	-	W	F	N.T.	N.T.	-	N.T.	N.T.	-
	-	N	M	48	56	+08	44	45	+01
	-	N	M	50	49	-01	46	47	+01
	-	W	M	56	51	-05	64	66	+02
	-	W	M	54	60	+04	60	66	+06
	-	N	F	53	45	-08	46	50	+04
	-	N	F	42	61	+19	51	64	+13
	-	N	M	47	72	+25	53	64	+11
	-	N	M	44	46	+02	40	47	+07
	-	M	M	46	54	+08	41	45	+04
	-	W	M	52	62	+10	48	53	+05
	-	N	M	41	50	+09	40	51	+11
	-	W	M	40	54	+14	41	51	+10
	-	N	M	56	48	-08	55	48	-07
	-	N	F	N.T.	54	-	N.T.	43	-
		N	F	39	68	+29	43	56	+13
		W	F	44	50	+06	43	46	+03
	-	N	F	42	52	+03	40	46	+06
		N	M	N.T.	N.T.	-	N.T.	N.T.	-
	-	N	M	50	50	-0-	42	49	+07
		W	M	34	59	+25	45	48	+03
	-	N	F	39	45	+07	46	51	+05
		N	F	46	49	+03	62	70	+08
	-	N	M	45	71	+26	45	57	+12
	-	M	F	44	45	+01	45	53	+08
		N	M	48	69	+21	52	58	+06
	-	N	M	34	56	+22	39	49	+10
		N	F	48	51	+03	46	59	+13
	-	W	F	52	78	+26	52	72	+20

PDC - MATHEMATICS
SEVENTH GRADE PARTICIPANTS
ITBS-STANDARDIZED TEST DATA

Name	Eco. Dep.	Race	Sex	Arithmetic G.E. Pre 4-'70	Arithmetic G.E. Post 4-'71	Arithmetic G.E. Change	Composite G.E. Pre 4-'70	Composite G.E. Post 4-'71	Composite G.E. Change
		W	F	52	78	+26	68	83	+25
		N	F	44	60	+16	58	66	+08
	-	W	M	N.T.	N.T.	-	N.T.	N.T.	-
		N	F	49	N.T.	-	49	N.T.	-
	-	W	M	48	44	-04	40	46	+06
	-	N	F	40	54	+14	43	51	+08
		W	M	N.T.	81	-	N.T.	55	-
		W	M	I	62	-	I	72	-
	-	N	M	45	59	+14	41	49	+08
		W	M	58	37	-21	47	42	-05
	-	N	F	N.T.	46	-	N.T.	37	-
		W	M	67	88	+21	65	77	+12

PDC - MATHEMATICS
EIGHTH GRADE PARTICIPANTS
ITBS-STANDARDIZED TEST DATA

Name	Eco. Dep.	Race	Sex	Arithmetic G.E. Pre 4-'70	Post 4-'71	Change	Composite G.E. Pre 4-'70	Post 4-'71	Change
		W	M	50	60	+10	57	69	+12
		W	M	68	I	-	54	I	-
		W	M	68	I	-	68	I	-
		N	M	N.T.	58	-	N.T.	59	-
	-	N	F	45	50	+05	65	69	+04
		W	F	56	62	+06	60	69	+09
		W	M	60	76	+16	63	75	+12
		W	M	48	N.T.	-	51	N.T.	-
	-	N	M	51	85	+34	41	58	+17
		N	F	46	51	+05	41	49	+08
	-	N	M	N.T.	57	-	N.T.	49	-
	-	N	F	57	58	+01	55	58	+03
	-	N	M	49	70	+21	54	65	+11
	-	W	M	N.T.	59	-	N.T.	44	-
	-	W	M	N.T.	N.T.	-	N.T.	N.T.	-
	-	N	F	56	82	+26	53	82	+29
	-	N	M	44	54	+10	47	48	+01
	-	N	M	50	60	+10	43	53	+10
		W	M	56	68	+12	63	67	+04
	-	N	F	51	56	+05	51	52	+01
	-	N	M	48	70	22	47	56	+09
	-	M	F	48	I	-	50	I	-
	-	W	F	N.T.	N.T.	-	N.T.	N.T.	-
	-	W	M	N.T.	68	-	N.T.	54	-
	-	N	M	46	65	+19	43	52	09
		W	M	48	66	+18	44	54	+10
	-	N	M	73	66	-07	57	59	+02
	-	N	F	38	51	+13	46	53	+07

Program objective 1 was accomplished.

2. The extent to which pupils responded positively to the PDC Math Program was measured by (a) questionnaires and (b) by student attendance.

A forced-choice questionnaire indicating subject preference was completed by all students in the individualized instruction PDC math activity in May, 1971. The preference the students indicated for mathematics as compared with language, reading and science is illustrated in Table 6.

Table 6. Choice of arithmetic as a preferred subject as measured by a forced-choice questionnaire.

Subject Pairs	Number	Percent
Arithmetic	20	45
Language	24	55
Arithmetic	14	32
Reading	30	68
Arithmetic	27	61
Science	17	39
Sum of choices for Arithmetic	61	46
Other Subjects	71	54

A second questionnaire was given to all students to measure their positive or negative feelings to the PDC math class only. The results obtained on this questionnaire are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. STUDENT RESPONSES TO A QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT THEIR FEELINGS TOWARD VARIOUS ASPECTS OF THE PDC MATH PROGRAM

Key: SA - Strongly Agree A - Agree N - Neither Agree nor Disagree D - Disagree SD - Strongely Disagree
(N Responses are not included in total positive and negative responses)

Item	SA No.	SA %	A No.	A %	N No.	N %	D No.	D %	SD No.	SD %	Total Positive No.	Total Positive %	Total Negative No.	Total Negative %
1. The work in this class this year made sense.	10	24.4	26	63.4	3	7.3	1	2.4	1	2.4	36	87.8	2	4.9
2. I was able to work at my own rate.	10	24.4	28	68.3	2	4.9	1	2.4	1	2.4	38	92.7	1	2.4
3. I was assigned a lot of work I was not weak in and did not need	0	00.C	3	7.3	11	26.8	18	43.9	9	22.0	27	65.9	3	7.3
4. I used many different kinds of materials.	8	19.5	26	63.4	2	4.9	3	7.3	2	4.9	34	82.9	5	12.2
5. I took tests only when the entire class was tested.	1	2.4	9	22.0	5	12.2	18	43.9	8	19.5	26	63.4	10	24.4
6. I prefer the regular math class to this class	5	12.2	9	22.0	6	14.6	14	34.1	7	17.1	21	51.2	14	34.1
7. I was never sure of what I was supposed to do when I went to this class.	6	14.6	12	29.3	6	14.6	14	34.1	3	7.3	17	41.5	18	43.9
TOTALS (Average)											28.4	70.0	7.6	18.5

As shown in Table 7, positive student response to the PDC Math Program was 70 percent and negative response was 18.5 percent.

Student attendance was used to measure the positive response of students to program. In grade 7, students in the PDC Math Program were present 91.6 percent of the time and absent 8.4 percent. Students in grade 8 were present 90.9 percent, absent 9.1 percent. For the total PDC Math Program, students attended 91.3 percent of the time and were absent 8.7 percent of the time.

Although the data does not indicate a preference for math over other subjects, students responded favorably to math classes in the PDC.

The evidence to support accomplishment of program objective 2 is inconclusive.

G. Budget

Salary:	One Teacher	$5620
Materials:	Consumable	78
	Non-consumable	1703
Equipment (Non reoccuring)		1063
Total		$8464

$8464 ÷ 74 pupils = $114.37 per pupil

74 pupils X 4.3 mo. ave. time in project X 20 da. per mo. = 6364 pupil days

$8464 ÷ 6364 = $1.33 per day per pupil cost

$1.33 per da. per pupil X 175 da. per school year. = $232.75 per pupil annual cost, exclusive of administration costs.

PART XII: MOST SUCCESSFUL ACTIVITY

Introduction

1. Name of local educational agency:

   El Dorado School District No. 15

2. For further information contact:

   James N. Riley, Federal Coordinator
   1115 West Hillsboro
   El Dorado, Arkansas 71730
   863-7263

3. Title of activity:

   Code 020 - Reading (Remedial)

4. Date when activity was initiated:

   June 1970 - Initiated with a summer workshop to train teachers and evaluate materials.

5. Continuation date:

   School term: 1971-72

Narrative

1. Objective: The student enrolled in remedial reading will know the principles of reading as measured by standardized pre- and post-tests.

During the month of June 1970, a Title I workshop for planning and developing the remedial reading program for seven elementary schools was conducted by the language arts supervisor, and three lead teachers. Sixteen elementary teachers volunteered to participate in the workshop. As an outcome of this summer activity, the following more specific objective resulted:

A selected group of students from grades two through six will increase their overall reading achievement one grade level during the 1970-71 school year as measured by pre- and post-testing using the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test (grades 1-3) and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (grades 4-6).

2. Services provided

In September 1970, seven reading laboratories or centers were equipped and staffed in seven schools to provide the services described herein. A variety of teaching techniques are used to teach the sequence of skills developed in the summer workshop. (Copy attached). Skills are taught by the following methods:

1. A visual method using filmstrips on the Tachomatic 500 and the T-Matic 150 Tachistoscope (Psychotechnics Machines). Curriculum filmstrips using the 888 projector to teach readiness skills.

2. An auditory method using the Landon Phonics Program, a recorded program accompanied by worksheets.

3. A visual-auditory method using Phonics in a Nutshell, a record-filmstrip program.

Each of these methods include follow-up materials for independent study. Other teaching activities include: discussion, question-answer drill, individualized supervised study tapes, filmstrips, workbooks, resource books, reading kits and textbooks. The types of interaction are teacher-to-student, student-to student, student - to - teacher, and media-to-student.

Classes vary in size from 6 to 15 pupils. Most of the pupils come from families of low to moderate income. If the parents are employed, the occupations are in the categories of day laborer or domestic; otherwise parents may be welfare cases, and the students receive free lunches and free school supplies.

Students who have visual or auditory problems or other health needs are referred to the Mobile Health Unit for testing. If the student proves to need glasses or special treatment which the patents cannot afford, the case is referred by the federal coordinator or language arts supervisor to an agency that provides these services.

Students are referred to the reading teacher by regular classroom teachers. The remedial teacher tests the student using the Informal Reading Inventory to determine his instructional reading level. She also gives the Doren Diagnostic Reading test in order to outline the reading needs of individual students. A folder containing a Checklist of Reading Skills (copy attached) is made for each student. He is trained to use all the equipment and materials in the laboratory that meet his particular needs. Each day as the student comes to the laboratory, he picks up his folder to check the area in which he will work on that day and to review the work which he did the previous day to see what suggestions for improvement were made by his teacher. Classes meet five times per week, and students remain in the laboratory from 30 to 50 minutes.

The classroom is organized around the teaching techniques previously described. Stations for listening, viewing, or teacher-to-student exchange are set up in various parts of the room so that the student can pick up his folder and go to his learning station for the day. He may need to remain at one learning station until he has mastered a series of lessons after which he may move to another station. At least one day a week is set aside for the student to choose the station which appeals to him most.

Special equipment includes the programs previously mentioned. In addition to these the laboratories contain SRA Reading Kits; transparencies, both commercial and teacher-made; McGraw-Hill reading filmstrips; the Imperial Primary Reading Program; the Acoustifone Reading Achievement Program; Bowman Reading Kits; Listen and Think tapes; tape-recorders, headsets, overhead projectors, and a listening table with 8 outlets. Supplementary readers and books for free reading are provided. Many visual aids are used by the teachers, some of which are teacher-made and some which are made by teacher aides on the Emergency School Assistance Program.

Reading teachers have used attractive bulletin boards, teaching charts, word cards, and word games to make reading appealing to the students and to make the reading laboratory a place where students really like to come.

3. Participants

Students who are two or more grade levels below their grade placement are referred to the reading laboratory by regular classroom teachers.

During 1970-71, 495 elementary students from grades 2 through 6 were enrolled in the program. The students ranged in age from 7 to 13. The sex distribution was approximately 60% male and 40% female. The ethnic distribution was approximately 75% Negro and 25% Caucasian.

As was previously stated, most of the students are from families of a low socio-economic level.

Students were pre- and post-tested (results are attached). The Peabody Picture Test was also given to most of the students to determine learning potential.

4. Staff

Teachers: Seven teachers whose teaching experience is from 5 to 20 years. All teachers are certified to teach in elementary school, some have Master's degrees or are working toward this degree. All of these teachers have been trained in the testing procedures used to screen their students and have been trained to operate and use all the provided equipment and materials.

Administrator: James N. Riley, Federal Coordinator. Holds an M.A. degree with post-graduate work in administration.

Specialist: Josephine R. McCall, Language Arts Supervisor. Holds an M.A. degree with 24 post-graduate hours most of which are in her subject area. Experienced as an elementary, junior high, senior high and college teacher.

5. Related Components:

Parent-teacher conferences were arranged by either parents or teachers as the need arose. At the end of each 9-week grading period a form showing an evaluation of the students' work was sent home to the parents. (See form attached).

In addition to the summer workshop, reading teachers met for in-service meetings throughout the school year as designated on the school calendar. The language arts supervisor visited each laboratory regularly and assisted teachers in implementing the program. Demonstration lessons were often conducted by the supervisor to help the reading teacher improve her own teaching techniques.

A six weeks summer reading program was conducted by six reading teachers and the language arts supervisor. The participants referred for this program were 9th grade students who were to enter the Corrective English Class in 1971-72 at East Campus. Since many of these students were on the summer NYC program, the class was not as large as teachers felt they could accomodate. The class was opened to all junior high school students who wished to improve their reading ability. This fact was publicized by the news media, and the class was soon filled.

The West Campus Cafeteria of El Dorado High School was turned into a large reading laboratory. Equipment and materials from the elementary schools and the junior high schools were used. New materials suitable for both remedial reading and Corrective English were evaluated during the six-weeks program. The six teachers were divided into teaching teams and pupils were assigned to each team. This part of the program was designed to train teachers in team teaching, a method to be used in the junior high school reading labs in 1971-72. It also provided training in the use of materials to be used by the Corrective English teacher at East Campus.

Reading deficiencies of each student were diagnosed by using the Botel Reading Test and the Wide-Range Spelling test. Other tests were administered to individual students as the need arose. Individualized programs were provided for each student according to his needs. Four days per week were structured and teacher directed. Interest centers were set up one day per week and students were allowed to work at the center of his choice.

EL DORADO REPORT CONT'D

7. Budget

The total cost of the activity completely funded under Title I was $79,473. A breakdown into categories of expenditures are:

Salaries	$ 64,025
Supplies	13,392
Equipment	2,057
Per pupil cost	104.70

REGION VIII EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER
P. O. Box 689
Magnolia, Arkansas 71753

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Title I - Remedial Reading Program
El Dorado

I. Program Identification No. 02 041 007 Date: Fall Semester 1971

Program Developed By: Mr. James N. Riley
Coordinator, El Dorado Public Schools

II. Evaluation Consultant: Dr. Gary Standridge
Region VIII Education Service Center

III. District: El Dorado

IV. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

During the month of June, 1970 the El Dorado Public School sponsored a Title I workshop for planning and developing reading laboratories in nine elementary schools. Mrs. Josephine McCall, language arts supervisor, and three lead teachers shared the workshop responsibilities. Sixteen elementary teachers participated in the workshop. The agenda included the following activities:

-Developing a sequence of reading skills to be taught and correlating it with laboratory equipment and materials
-Learning additional methods for managing new materials and equipment in laboratory situations
-Training in diagnosing reading problems
-Practicing appropriate simulated exercises in the above workshop activities

The reading laboratories and teachers were ready for students in September, 1970. Positive results of the workshop were evident as teachers diagnosed reading deficiencies and managed the new materials and equipment according to appropriate learning situations for students. Students who were two or more reading levels below grade placement were recommended by the classroom teacher to receive remedial instruction in the reading laboratories. The students were then tested by the reading teacher to determine their potential for remediation.

During the 1970-71 school year the reading laboratories were evaluated in terms of student achievement. There were approximately 450 elementary students enrolled in this program. The students ranged in age from 6 to 13. The sex distribution was approximately 66 percent male and 34 percent female. The ethnic distribution was 25 percent Caucasian and 75 percent Negro. The 9 teachers participating in the program ranged in teaching experience from

5 to 20 years. Most of the students came from families of low to moderate income. The parents' occupations usually fell in one of three categories: day laborer, domestic, or welfare.

The classes were departmentalized, schedules were fixed, progression was graded and there were 30 to 50 minutes in a class period. Classes met five times a week. The teacher pupil ratio was about 1-12.

The teachers employed a variety of teaching activities. Skills were taught by a visual method using the Tachomatic 500 and the T-Matic 150 Tachistoscope (Psychotechnics Machines); an auditory method using Landon Phonics Program: and the visual-auditory method using Phonics in a Nutshell, a record-filmstrip program. Each of these methods included follow up materials for independent study. Other teaching activities included: discussion, question and answer, drill, individualized supervised study tapes, filmstrips, workbooks, resource books, and reading kits. The types of interaction were teacher to student, student to student, and media to student.

The 9 laboratories were equipped with tape recorders, overhead projectors, film projectors, teaching machines, films and filmstrips and records. The special equipment included the Landon Phonics Program, Psychotechnics Machines, Acoustiphone Reading Achievement Program, SRA Reading Kits, Reading Filmstrips by McGraw Hill, Imperial Primary Reading Program, Bowmar Reading Kits, Listen and Think tapes, Webster-McGraw Films, headsets and listening tables with 8 to 12 outlets. The cost of each laboratory ranged from $3,500 to $4,500.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES:

1. The second and third grade students enrolled in the reading laboratories during the 1970-71 academic year will achieve at least a 1.0 grade level gain in reading as measured by the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test.

2. The fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students enrolled in the reading laboratories during the 1970-71 academic year will achieve at least a 1.0 grade level gain in reading as measured by the Vocabulary and Comprehension Sections of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills.

3. The students enrolled in the reading laboratories during the 1970-71 academic year will achieve at least a 1.0 grade level gain in reading as measured by the Betts Informal Reading Inventory.

V. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS AND SUMMARY

The students enrolled in the remedial reading program were pretested in October, 1970. The test battery included the Gates-MacGinitie, the Betts Informal Reading Inventory, and the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills. In late April the students were post tested.

The objective stated that at least one year's average gain in achievement was expected. Presented in Tables I, II, and III

the pre/post test comparisons. The greatest gains were obtained on the Betts Informal Reading Inventory. Since this test was administered individually the results should be more accurate than the group administered test, i.e., the ITBS and the Gates-MacGinitie. On the group administered test there were gross discrepancies on a number of individual pre/post scores. For example some students gained two to four years in grade level achievement and other students lost that much. Such findings are common when students reading on a pre-primer level take a standardized achievement test designed for students reading at least at a third grade level.

Generally the expected one year's average achievement gain was attained. The program was successful in terms of the stated objectives. Part of the success can be attributed to the language arts supervisor and three lead teachers who planned and developed the summer workshop to train teachers and to the teachers who participated in the month long workshop. Their efforts paid off in terms of increased student achievement. Part of the success can also be attributed to the regular classroom teacher. There is no way to measure the effectiveness of each part, but the regular classroom teacher and the remedial laboratory teacher (whether they were aware of each other's efforts or not) were effective in attaining the stated objectives.

While visiting in the classrooms and in the remedial reading laboratories the evaluator observed some things that the program personnel may want to consider for the current 1971-72 school year. First, during the past year there was much more emphasis on "hardware" than software". The machines are great for supplemental work but if the basal texts are not also used in the laboratories the entire sequence of reading skills to be taught becomes subjective guesswork on the part of the remedial laboratory teacher.

Secondly, there generally is little coordination of teaching activities between the regular reading teacher and the remedial laboratory teacher. The regular reacher knows that some of her pupils attend reading laboratory for so many minutes a day but she is not very much aware of the kinds of specific reading skills being developed by the individual student while he is in the laboratory. The laboratory teacher, likewise, does not know very much about what is going on in the regular classroom during reading.

Both suggestions, if implemented, will give added strength to an already effective Title I remedial reading program.

TABLE I

A PRE (FALL 1970) POST (SPRING 1971) TEST COMPARISON OF SCORES ON THE GATES MCGINITTIE READING TEST FOR SECOND AND THIRD GRADE STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THE EL DORADO, ARKANSAS TITLE I REMEDIAL READING PROGRAM.

	Vocabulary			Comprehension		
Grade Level	Pre (Fall 1970)	Post (Spring 1971)	Gain	Pre (Fall 1970)	Post (Spring 1971)	Gain
2nd (N=29	1.4)	2.0	+.6	1.7	2.1	+.4
3rd (N=51	1.9)	2.4	+.5	2.1	2.4	+.3

TABLE II

A PRE/POST TEST COMPARISON (VOCABULARY AND READING COMPREHENSION SECTION OF THE IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS) OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THE EL DORADO, ARKANSAS TITLE I REMEDIAL PROGRAM.

	Vocabulary			Comprehension		
Grade Level	Pre (Fall 1970)	Post (Spring 1971)	Gain	Pre (Fall 1970)	Post (Spring 1971)	Gain
4th (N=92)	2.3	3.1	+ .8	2.2	2.9	+.7
5th (N=56)	2.7	3.7	+1.0	2.9	3.6	+.7
6th (N=56)	3.5	4.4	+ .9	3.5	4.2	+.7

TABLE III

A PRE/POST TEST COMPARISON OF STUDENT SCORES ON THE BETTS INFORMAL READING INVENTORY.

Grade Level	Pre (Fall 1970)	Post (Spring 1971)	Gain
2nd (N=62)	Pre-Primer	1.0	+___
3rd (N-83)	Primer	1.9	+___
4th (N-64)	.9	2.5	+1.6
5th (N=88)	2.1	3.1	+1.0
6th (N=98)	2.5	3.6	+1.1

PART XII: MOST SUCCESSFUL ACTIVITY

Introduction.

1. Wynne School District #9

2. Gene Catterton, P.O. Box 69, Wynne Ark. 72396

   Phone: 501: 238-2558

3. Reading: "Using Regular Classroom Teacher as a Remedial Reading Teacher"

4. September 1970 -

5. This activity will continue through 1971-72

NARRATIVE.

A. Objective.

1. The students in grades 6-8 whose reading comprehension level is two or more years below level will increase their comprehension in reading as demonstrated by scores on the SRA Achievement Test.

2. The incomming first grade students will be screened to indentify their readiness to read so as to facilitate instruction at appropriate levels in reading.

3. The students in grades 2-5 whose reading comprehension level is one and one-half years below level will increase their level of comprehension as measured by the SRA Achievement Test.

4. The regular classroom teachers in the elementary school will be paired and scheduled so that each teacher will devote time each day working with small groups, (5-10) of students in remedial reading to increase the individualized instruction as measured by the teacher pupil ratio.

B. Services provided.

1. Techniques employed.

The teachers were paired so that one of the pair would work with a small group (5-10) while the other worked in an enrichment activity with a large group (50-55). The small group was selected on the basis of standardized test scores and teacher recommendation. Individualized instruction was used in the small remedial group.

2. Class size.

The average for all the small classes in grades 1-5 was 9.4. For grades 6-8 it was 11.0.

3. Classroom organization.

This was very flexible ranging from sessions on the floor to individual study.

4. Equipment and materials.

Audio-visual equipment used: cassette players, filmstrip projectors, record players, 16mm projectors, overhead projector and tape recorders.

There was $6,394 of special materials acquired for these classes ranging from transparencies and filmstrips to sets of books written on low vocabulary-high interest level.

5. Special techniques.

Variety in presentation and activities was provided throughout the year.

6. Counseling and guidance.

The counselor was used in selecting the students to be involved in the small groups of grades 1-5. The counselor worked very closely with these activities in grades 6-8.

7. Health and nutrition.

Every child in this activity was provided a hot lunch every day. If the child needed dental work, medical assistance, clothing and/or viusal help these were all provided.

8. This service was provided during shool hours by making use of flexible scheduling. The small sections were scheduled to meet for 50-55 minutes each day. Some of these were in a split period while others were in a block time.

Basically - 1 hour per day, five (5) days per week, for 36 weeks.

C. Participants.

The counselor helped in the selection of students. Basically from each of the paired rooms, five students were selected on the basis of test scores, teacher recommendation and previous performance.

There were 40-50 students involved at each grade level 1-8. Sixty-three percent were boys. Eighty-six percent were more than 1 year below level in reading comprehension.

D. Staff.

1. Number of staff members.

a. First grade (5 teachers - 1 hour each day).

b. Second grade (4 teachers - 1 hour each day).

c. Third-fifth (4 teachers each grade - 1 hour each day).

d. First-fifth (1 control teacher in each grade - 1 hour each day)

e. Sixth-eighth grade (1 teacher each grade - three to five hours each day).

2. Training.

a. All teachers involved were certified teachers but did not have much formal training as remedial teachers.

b. These teachers met regularly together by grade levels throughtout the year.

c. The teachers functioned as a remedial teacher in a small group situation.

E. Related components.

See(b)immediately above.

F. Effectiveness.

Dr. Donald Wright of Arkansas State University did an evaluation of our reading activity. The results of this evaluation are included on the next fifteen (15) pages.

WYNNE REPORT CONT'D

BUDGET

Title I

200	Personnel	59,690
	Instructional materials	2,890
	Testing	525
400	Health Services	2,500
800	Fixed charges	7,130
1100	Community Services	1,440
		74,175

Migratory

200	Personnel	6,095
	In-Service	2,500
800	Fixed charges	800
		9,395

Title III, ESEA

200	Personnel	18,000
	Materials	2,300
800	Fixed charges	2,376
		22,676

Total Cost	$106,246
Total pupils	474
Per Pupil Cost	$ 224.15

WYNNE PILOT PROJECT
Using Regular Elementary Teachers as
a Remedial Reading Teacher

The general objective of the pilot project was to demonstrate the use of regular classroom teachers in a remedial reading program in grades one through six. This objective has been met as evidenced by the operating class schedule. The small and large groups are identified with corresponding times and teachers. The teachers have been paired so that a modified form of team teaching can be utilized. Since the design of the project listed regular classroom teachers, an effort was made to rotate the teachers in both large and small group instruction. Only in isolated cases was this effort not fulfilled.

General Organization

The general organization of the project is that two teachers, no specific qualifying criteria, and their classes are paired so that a form of team teaching could be utilized in teaching reading. During a designated segment of time, one teacher works with identified below average readers from both classes in small group instruction, while the other team member works with the remainder of both classes in enrichment activities. There is a lack of evidence of in-service organization, and planning sessions for the teachers. The building principals indicated that these sessions did occur but more on a small group (2 or 3 people) or individually with the teacher and principal or the building library-media specialist. This type of communication, according to the people involved, has created a much closer working relationship among the building staff. The interaction

among the teachers, administrators, etc., regarding the instructional materials for the small groups is a continuous on-going discussion rather than planned sessions with planned topics.

The students were identified for the small reading groups primarily on teacher recommendations. These recommendations included criteria such as; student performance on pre-test, student performance on daily class work, and teacher observation. In cases where the pre-test score and the teachers opinion were in contrast, the opinion of the classroom teacher was given the greatest consideration. The students were identified, in grades 2 - 6, after approximately one month of school and the remedial reading program was started in these grades in October, 1970. Control groups were established in grades 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, using the time element and regular classroom materials as the difference in treatment. No control group was reported on post-test scores for grade 2, and no control group was established for grade 6.

The range in class size for the small reading groups ranged from eight to fourteen. The total number of students involved in the program per grade level is as follows: Grade 1, four groups, 40 students; Grade 2, four groups, 40 students; Grade 3, four groups, 40 students; Grade 4, three groups, 42 students for 50 minutes, three groups, 24 students for 20 minutes; Grade 5, three groups, 39 students for 50 minutes, three groups, 27 students for 20 minutes; Grade 6, three groups, 41 students. This represents a total of 293 students in the experimental remedial reading program.

Specific Objectives

IV A, To identify the learning characteristics of incoming first graders through screening devices..., so as to facilitate instruction at the appropriate levels. Due to lack of time, an acceptable screening device, and expertise in utilizing the screening process, the remedial groups were not formed in the first grade until the beginning of the second semester, January, 1971. The first grade teachers and the principal utilized the students performance during the first semester to identify those first graders in need of special reading instruction.

IV B, To place first grade students who are not ready to participate in the regular first grade instructional program as identified by a screening process in special readiness program which will enable them to enter the regular program at some point during the year. The pre-test, Scott Foresman Reading Program Inventory Survey Test, was not administered until March 1 through 18, 1971, then the post-test was administered in late May, 1971. A decision was reached with the Wynne project director that analysis of these test results would not contribute to the evaluation of the program. However, an acceptable screening device has been identified and in-service sessions for the Wynne staff have been conducted so specific objectives IV A and IV B can be analyzed at the end of 1972 and contribute to the program evaluation at this time.

IV C, To arrange a class schedule so the students who are reading below grade will receive more individual instruction throughout the year so as to narrow the gap in their reading level as composed to the normal. A class schedule was arranged whereby students so identified would receive additional instruction in small group sessions. This arrangement infers that more individual instruction is administered in small groups than in large groups. The statistical technique "t" test was employed

to test the difference of the means of the pre-test, administered April, 1970, and the post-test, administered April, 1971, results for each grade level to determine if significant progress was made in reading performance. The results of the statistical analysis is reported below:

Grade 2

SRA Form D and C

	Statistical Values						
Comparison	N	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Growth Mean	"t" Value Required .05 level	"t" Value Computed	Signi-Ficance
Pre-Post Test Experimental	34	1.80	2.46	0.65	2,035	6.07	H.S.

There were thirty-four second grade students participating in the small group reading program that scores on both the pre and post test were reported. The grade equivalent mean on the pre-test equaled 1.80. The grade equivalent mean on the post-test equaled 2.46. The difference between the pre and post test, or the growth mean, was found to be 0.65 grade level equivalent. This mean growth was found to be highly significant at the .05 level of confidence indicating that the growth was not a result of chance but was a result of the treatment in the instructional process. The standardized test used as pre and post evaluations were pre-test, SRA-Form D; post-test, SRA-Form C.

Grade 3
SRA Form D and C

Comparison	N	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Growth Mean	"t" Value Required .05 level	"t" Value Computed	Significance
Pre-Post Test Experimental	35	2.1	2.05	-.057	2.03	0.4477	N.S
Pre-Post Test Control	8	2.286	2.788	.50	2.31	1.213	N.S
Pre-Test Exp - Control					2.02	0.8699	N.S
Post-Test Exp - Control					2.02	3.705	S
Growth Exp - Control					2.02	4.988	S

There were thirty-five students in the third grade small group reading program that scores on both pre and post tests were reported. In addition, there were eight students in a control group that had both pre and post test scores. The statistical analysis reveal that the experimental group had a pre-test mean of 2.10 grade level equivalent and a 2.05 post-test mean grade level equivalent. This difference computed to no significant difference in reading progress and the slight difference was in a negative direction. The control group had a pre-test mean of 2.286 grade level equivalent and a 2.788 post-test grade level equivalent. The growth mean of 0.50 failed to reach the required probability level for significance. Following the analysis, the evaluation team decided to further inspect the performance of this group by comparing additional areas between the experimental and control group. The comparison on pre-test means yielded no significant difference; but, the post-test scores yielded a significant difference in the performance of the control group as did the comparison of the growth means.

An agreement was made between the administrator of the Reading Program and the Evaluation Team to cross-check test performances by another test on one group of students. The evaluator, without knowledge of the administrator, randomly pre-determined the group to compare. Grade three was that group. The second test used to study the performance of the grade three students was Scott-Foresman Reading Program Inventory-Survey Test, forms A and B. The results of the statistical analysis appears below:

Grade 3

Scott-Foresman Forms A and B

Comparison	Statistical Values						
	N	Pre Test Mean	Post Test Mean	Growth Mean	"t" Value Required .05 level	"t" Value Computed	Significance
Pre-Post Experimental	36	53.13	60.97	8.16	2.03	7.84	N.S.
Pre-Post Control	9	59.2	64.1	4.88	2.31	1.15	N.S.
Pre-Test Exp - Control					2.02	1.53	N.S.
Post-Test Exp - Control					2.02	1.17	N.S.
Growth Exp - Control					2.02	1.1756	N.S.

There were thirty-six students in grade three that were in the small experimental group reading program and had scores reported on both the pre and post test. Also, there were nine students in grade three that were in a control group that had scores reported on both pre and post tests. The statistical analysis revealed a highly significant difference between the pre-post test score means for the experimental group while the control group yielded no significant difference in their pre-post test mean scores. Aditional comparisons yielded no significant difference between the experimental and control groups relative to pre-test mean scores, post-test mean scores, or gain in reading progress.

Grade 4

SRA Forms C and D

	Statistical Values						
Comparison	N	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Growth Mean	"t" Value Required .05 level	"t" Value Computed	Significance
Pre-Post Experimental	49	2.48	3.92	1.43	2.015	12.20	H.S.
Pre-Post Control	7	2.94	3.64	0.70	2.45	4.85	S.
Pre-Test Exp - Control					2.01	2.28	S.
Post-Test Exp - Control					2.01	1.37	N.S.
Growth Exp - Control					2.01	3.91	S.
Post-Test Group 8 - 14	17 / 32		3.82 / 3.97		2.015	0.915	N.S.

There were forty-nine students in grade four of the small group experimental reading program that had scores on both the pre and post test reported. A control group of seven students also had scores reported on both tests. The pre-test mean of the experimental group was 2.48 grade equivalent and the post-test mean was 3.92. This realized a mean growth difference of 1.43 which when analyzed by the statistical "t" test revealed a highly significant difference. The pre-test mean of the control group was 2.94 grade equivalent and the grade equivalent mean for the post test was 3.64. This realized a mean growth of 0.70 grade equivalent which showed a significant difference in reading growth. An analysis of the pre-test means for the two groups revealed a significant difference in entering performance in favor of the control group. Even though the experimental group revealed a greater growth the unequal grouping resulted in a failure to show a significant difference in post-test means. The finding of no

significance on the post-test led to a comparative analysis of the growth difference between the two groups. This analysis revealed a significant difference for the experimental group.

The organizational pattern for grade four had three groups of eight students each in an experimental section for 20 minutes per session and three groups of fourteen students each for 50 minutes per session. An analysis of the performance of these two groups revealed no significant difference in their performance. The pre-test, post-test was SRA Forms C and D, administered April, 1970 and April, 1971.

Grade 5

SRA Forms C and D

Comparison	Statistical Values						
	N	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Growth Mean	"t" Value Required .05 level	"t" Value Computed	Signi-fincance
Pre-Post Experimental	54	3.73	4.0	0.268	2.01	1.617	N.S.
Pre-Post Control	8	3.66	3.6	0.06	2.45	0.221	N.S.
Pre-Test Exp - Control					2.00	0.286	N.S.
Post-Test Exp - Control					2.00	1.96	N.S.
Growth Exp - Control					2.00	1.63	N.S.
Post-Test Groups 9 - 14					2.005	0.441	N.S.

There were fifty-four fifth grade students in the small group experimental reading group that reported scores on both the pre and post test. The control group contained eight students that had scores on both tests. The mean scores for the groups were compared in various areas and no significant differences were found. There were, as a result of the analysis, indications that the experimental group made considerable more gain than the control group; however, this gain was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. This suggests that such a difference in mean scores could have been a result of chance factors rather than treatment. The analysis of the mean scores for the different organizational structure of the groups within the experimental groups revealed no significant difference between the performance of the students in smaller groups (nine students) and less time per session (twenty minutes), and students in large groups (fourteen students) and more time per session (fifty minutes). The difference in performance of these two groups were very nominal.

Grade 6

There were forty-one sixth grade students involved in the small group experimental reading program. The analysis of the test scores revealed that the level of SRA test used in the post-test evaluation did not provide for a wide enough range to truly discriminate between the students performance. The lowest possible score on the post-test was a grade equivalent of 4.1 and this did not measure the reading level of this group. It was, in turn, agreed with the Wynne project director that this was invalid data and no analysis would be made of the test scores. Without discriminating data from the pre and post tests, any analysis would contaminate the conclusions and recommendations regarding the group and in turn the project.

WYNNE PILOT PROJECT

The primary purpose of this pilot project was to demonstrate the use of regular elementary teachers as remedial reading teachers. In order to accomplish the purpose of the project the procedures were designed to (1) pair the teachers in each grade level to enable one teacher to work with a small reading group (8 - 14 students) selected from both classes, while the other teacher worked with large group activities; (2) to identify the students to participate in the remedial reading small groups from pre-test scores and teachers recommendations; (3) to establish control groups for comparison; (4) to utilize all reading teachers in the project; and (5) to analyze the results by student performance on standardized pre and post tests.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions and recommendations regarding Phase I of the Wynne Pilot Project were drawn from the analyzis of activities, the results of the pre and post test comparison, and insight gained by the consulting team conducting the evaluation. Based on aforementioned data, the following conclusions and recommendations appear justified:
(1) Conclusion: The learning characteristics of incoming first graders were not identified as stated in the proposal.
Recommendation: The administrator of the pilot project identify specifically the name of a screening device and the date for administering such devise before the program is initiated in the fall of 1971. Specific procedures, materials, and personnel use should be reported to the Title III project director by 1 August, 1971 and the results of the screening reported no later than 1 October, 1971.
(2) Conclusion: As a result of no screening device, the first grade students who were not ready to participate in the regular instructional program were not identified and placed into special readiness programs until it was too late to analyze and evaluate the related project objective.

Recommendation: The complete screening process, included the results of the screening device and teacher appraisals, should be completed prior to 1 October, 1971. This would enable the project staff to identify and place the students in the special readiness program by this date or very soon thereafter. It is imperative that the procedures for selecting the students for placement be recorded and interpreted for dissemination.

(3) Conclusion: A class schedule was arrange so that students who were reading below grade level would receive more individual instruction throughout the year so as to narrow the gap in their reading level as compared to the normal.

Recommendation: A similar type class schedule be arranged for the 1971-72 project year.

(4) Conclusion: The regular classroom teachers were "paired" so that a modified form of team teaching would be utilized to provide remediation to the students reading below grade level in grades 2 - 6. There were no evaluative criteria to "select" the teachers for the small groups and in addition, all staff members were used on a rotation basis in the reading program.

Recommendation: The same type of scheme by employed for utilizing regular teachers for the 1971-72 project year. Considerations should be given to those teachers that might request to not be assigned to the small reading groups. The procedures for group assignment and the rotation plan should be recorded and reported to the project director by 1 October, 1971.

(5) Conclusion: The grade two students in the remedial reading program made a significant growth in their reading level; therefore, regular classroom teachers did function effectively as remedial reading teachers on this grade level.

Recommendation: A control group need be established for this grade level with appropriate controls over the activities. The teachers involved with this level continue with the successful activities. The teachers of grade two record all instructional procedures and share these within the group and among the project teachers.

(6) Conclusion: There is a difference in the reading growth as measured by the two types of tests, SRA and Scott-Foresman, at the third grade level for the experimental group. These inconsistencies need be studied before great confidence can be placed with either measurement.
Recommendation: A detailed study should be started immediately to review the procedures employed by the teachers both before and during the actual test. Stronger yet, it is necessary to compare objectives used in the class and the objectives measured by the test instrument.
(7) Conclusion: According to the results of the SRA instruments, the students in the control group of grade three gained significantly more in reading ability than those of the experimental group. However, neither group showed a significant difference in the means of the pre and post tests.
Recommendation: The instructional procedures employed by the teachers in grade three be throughly studied and revised. The teachers should have carefully structured planning sessions and the suggested activities be implemented in the classroom. Consideration be given to utilizing either internal or external consultive assistance. The record of these planning sessions should be reported to and review for dissemination by the project director.
(8) Conclusion: According to the results of the Scott-Foresman instruments, the grade three experimental group showed a significant gain in reading ability during the year. The control group, although not showing a significant growth, did register enough growth that there was no significant difference found between the increase in test scores reported.
Recommendation: The instructional procedures employed in the third grade experimental group be critiqued and upgraded where feasible, and continued use of these activities by utilized.
(9) Conclusion: Regular classroom teachers did perform effectively as remedial reading teachers in grade four.
Recommendation: The instructional precedures employed by the teachers of grade four be critequed and upgraded where feasible, and continued use of these activities be utilized. The teachers should systematically hold planning sessions and information from these sessions should be recorded

and reviewed for dissemination by the project director.

(10) Conclusion: Students may be grouped with equal effectiveness for reading instruction in either small groups, 8 students, and small amount of time, 20 minutes; or larger groups, 14 students, and longer time, 50 minutes.

Recommendation: Either of the organizational patterns may be utilized.

(11) Conclusion: Regular classroom teachers did not perform effectively as remedial reading teachers in grade five.

Recommendation: During the second year of the pilot project additional in-service and planning sessions be structured for these teachers. A review of the instructional procedures be conducted and revisions be made. Consultative aid either from within the district or outside the district could prove beneficial to these teachers. The information from the systematic planning sessions should be recorded and reviewed for dissemination by the project director.

General Project Conclusion: The Wynne Pilot Project has demonstrated that the procedures and objectives are acceptable for utilizing regular classroom teachers as remedial reading teachers in grades 1 - 6.

Recommendation: In order for the project to adequately be evaluated and procedures disseminated for the purpose of replication, it is necessary for the entire project staff to record all activities related to the project. This includes organizational meetings, inservice meetings, instructional planning sessions, unique instructional techniques utilized, and evaluation instruments. For the project to reach it's potential implication for Arkansas schools, it is of essence that it continue for at least one more academic year.

1. Name of local agency: Bay-Brown School District No. 21

2. Wayne Dent (retired) Jim Parrish now Superintendent, P.O. Box 678, Bay, Arkansas 72411 Phone: 781-3296.

3. Title of activity: Exploratory program for five year old children-----Kindergarten.

4. Date activity was initiated: August 25, 1970; start of the 1970-71 school year.

This program has been continued this year.

The kindergarten program was operated in connection with the Head Start Program operated by the Crowley's Ridge Development Council. This group consisted of seventeen educationally and economic deprived children.

NARRATIVE

A. Objectives of this program were as follows:

1. Teach children to adjust to school.
2. Teach motor coordination in use of school supplies.
3. Recognize objects related to school life.

B. Services provided:

1. The teachers (kindergarten and Head Start) were interested in teaching children to know each other and to adjust to different personalities. To help children to adjust from home to school life.

2. The class size was limited to not more than twelve to fifteen in both kindergarten and Head Start. The Head Start selected seventeen pupils who spent the entire year in that class. The Kindergarten class consisted of three twelve week sessions with twelve to fifteen in each section.

3. Since pupils of necessity had to use school transportation, pupils remained in school a full day. Class schedule consisted of play periods, games, color painting, rest and nap periods, morning and afternoon snacks along with a regular school lunch.

4. Toys and educational materials of the five year old level were used. Miniature household articles were used to implement learning.

5. These children were taken on field trips to places of interest on an average of one trip each week.

6. The school counseler made available the SRA Primary Mental Ability Test for the Kindergarten group. The Head Start used their own tests. These were used to help the teachers work toward adjustments on weaknesses.

One case related:

One child was discovered with a speech defect. She was referred to the Arkansas Children's Development Center. After some trips and consultations, it was determined that her basic problem was emotional. With the help of this center, this child advanced two years in mental ability during the five months period.

C. Participants

These children selected for Head Start were selected on the basis of low income of the family. The Kindergarten was divided into two groups. This program was made available to all children eligible for kindergarten. In selecting groups, these factors were involved: economic level, cultural background, and educational level of the family. These children were selected from different levels, in order to have a better balance of children for learning to live and work together.

D. Staff

This is added to the regular report.

Comments of this year's first grade teachers who received these Kindergarten children of last year.

1. They were ready and anxious to start to school.
2. They were emotionally ready for school
3. They had no problem playing together.
4. They were much better adjusted.
5. Their motor coordination was good.
6. They knew objects, colors, pictures, etc.
7. They were now ready to attack work skills.

SECTION - V

INSERVICE TRAINING

FY 1971

EVALUATION INFORMATION

IN-SERVICE TRAINING - TEACHER AND TEACHER AIDES

LEA	INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING	TEACHERS		AIDES	
		30 Hours	10 Hours	30 Hours	10 Hours
28	State College of Arkansas	21	25	39	51
16	Southern State	21	14	29	16
18	University of Arkansas at Monticello	6	8	66	16
18	Arkansas State University	49		69	
10	University of Arkansas	11		18	
1	Arkansas A M & N			16	
2	Harding	5		4	
1	Henderson	1			
94	GRAND TOTALS	114	47	241	83

SECTION - VI

COMMUNITY AND PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

COMMUNITY AND PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Total LEA Title I Advisory Group Meetings Held	1,350
*Average Number of Meetings Per District	4

Total Number of Advisory Committee Representatives by Categories:

Parents of Title I Participants	1,864
School Personnel	900
PTA Members	777
Civic Organizations	287
Others	270
Total Representatives	4,098
*Average Number of Advisory Committee Representatives Per District	11

* The above information is based on 379 Title I projects.